

STATE OF CALIFORNIA{PRIVATE }
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

MEETING OF THE
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

CALTRANS DISTRICT OFFICE
4050 TAYLOR STREET
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92110

THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 2010
9:00 A.M.

A P P E A R A N C E S

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Hamid Bahadori, Chairperson
 Farhad Mansourian
 Jacob Babico
 John Fisher, Vice Chairperson
 Wayne Henley
 Jeff Knowles
 Robert Maynard
 Deborah Wong

CALTRANS PERSONNEL

Devinder Singh
 Johnny Bhullar
 Jesse Bhullar
 Dario Senior
 Adam Fukushima
 Robert Copp

ALSO PRESENT

Jim Baross
 California Bicycle Advisory Committee

 Nancy O'Connor
 California Air Resources Board

 Chad Dorinside
 Best Highway Safety Practices Institute

A P P E A R A N C E SALSO PRESENT (CONTINUED)

Gil Hernandez
City of Riverside

Robert Leone
San Diego County Bicycle Coalition

Conrad Lipinski
City of Dana Point

Kathy Keeyan
San Diego County Bicycle Coalition

Mr. Zabir
City of Poway, San Diego

Dave Roseman
City Engineer, City of Long Beach

Ron Keith
Orange County Transportation Authority

Chalap Sadam
Traffic Consultant

Edgar Monroy
City of San Diego

Steve Shladover
U.C. Berkeley Institute of Transportation Studies.

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Organization Items</u>	
1. Introduction	1
2. Approval of Minutes (September 24, 2009 Meetings)	5
3. Membership (Election of Chairman, Vice Chairman)	5
4. Public Comments	8
<u>Agenda Items</u>	
5. Public Hearing	9
08-18 Proposal to adopt "NO IDLING COMMERCIAL VEHICLES & SCHOOL BUSES" Sign (Requested by Air Resource Board-Item moved from Tabled Item To Action Items)	9
09-23 Proposal to Adopt NO PARKING signs during School days to CA MUTCD Section 2B.39 (Requested By San Bernardino CO.)	57
10-1 Proposal to Revise CA MUTCD Section 4D 105(CA) and Table 4D-109 CA MUTCD (Requested By City of Vacaville and Orange Co. Traffic Authority.)	195
10-2 Proposal to amend existing typical applications and adopt new TA's for accommodating bicyclists in TTC zones and to Revise CA MUTCD Sections 6D.101(CA) and 6G.05 and added a new Table 6H-1(CA)	104
6. Request for Experimentation	
10-3 Experiment with Second Train Warning Sign "Additional Train May Approach" with a Symbol Sign (Submitted by City of Riverside)	42
10-4 Experiment with Bicycle Box at the Signalized Intersection (Submitted by Caltrans District 5)	158

I N D E X

<u>Agenda Items (Continued)</u>	<u>Page</u>
7. Discussion Items	
10-5 When Children are Present (School Sign)	308
10-6 Proposal to Restructure the CTCDC	333
8. Information on CA MUTCD Training	
9. Information Items	
10-7 MUTCD 2009	317
10. Tabled Item	
08-22 Proposal to Amend CA MUTCD Section 10C.15 & 10C.23 (Item deferred)	
06-7 MUTCD 2003 Revision No. 1 (Pharmacy Signing) (Proposed to Adopt Pharmacy Signing in CA)	
11. Next Meeting	372
12. Adjournment	377

P R O C E E D I N G S

COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Good morning. We are going to call the meeting to order, so I'd appreciate it if you'd take your seats please.

Can you hear us back there? Okay, no problem, we don't need our mics. These mics that you see are for recording, the man transcribing the minutes of the meeting.

Good morning everyone. I'm going to call the meeting of January 21st of the California Traffic Control Devices Committee to order. My name is Hamid Bahadori, I'm with the Automobile Club of Southern California.

By the way, before we go and we start with the introduction, I would like to congratulate our Committee for having the foresight, it rains in San Diego only ten days of the year and it rains this hard once every ten years, so a few months ago we knew to pick the right date, you know, and just also that we know how well we are in forecasting and planning.

We are going to start with the introduction and we'll go with my right -- actually, Farhad, if you don't mind, first I would like to thank the District 11 for hosting the meeting, and we have a representative from District 11. This is a wonderful room. I was just sharing with Bill that this room is named after Jesus Garcia, who was a former District Director here, and Jesus and I serve

1 on another Committee and I called him and I said, hey, we
2 are meeting in your room, you want to show up? And he was
3 in the hospital last week so, he's doing well now but, he
4 didn't want to get out here in this wet weather. But, a
5 recognition of Mr. Garcia also.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SAN DIEGO REPRESENTATIVE: I just
7 want to say a few words, say thank you and welcome the
8 Committee down to San Diego and, you know, like he
9 mentioned, it's not very often I get to come in and say a
10 few words and say, gee, you know, usually I say enjoy our
11 weather, you know, go out. I guess I can't do that this
12 time so I'm kind of stumped but, on the flip side, I
13 appreciate you guys coming down and being here and taking
14 advantage of our facilities. We appreciate you and welcome
15 you. I think the weather, on the flip side, I know you guys
16 are involved a lot with the delineation of the different
17 traffic measures that we use out on our facilities and our
18 highways, and today is a good example of where it's really
19 important to have very clear and well, you know, designed
20 and signed and delineated facilities, because when you have
21 this inclement weather, you don't want people looking around
22 trying to figure out where they're going and what they're
23 doing, because they're concentrating on the road. So, I
24 think it's good in that regard. And that's about it. I
25 just want to say thank you and, you know, certainly come

1 down anytime you can. I appreciate your coming down to the
2 Region, and we appreciate you being here.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you very
4 much. We appreciate you allowing us to use your facilities.

5 Okay, with that, we're going to go to
6 introduction, and I'm going to start on the right side of
7 the table.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Good morning
9 everybody, I'm Farhad Mansourian, I'm with Marin County
10 Public Works, and I'm one of the two representatives of
11 Counties in California.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: My name is Jeff
13 Knowles, I'm the City Traffic Engineer for the City of
14 Vacaville, and I am here representing The League of
15 California Cities Northern Section.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'm Wayne Henley with
17 the Caltrans Traffic Operations.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I'm Robert Maynard with
19 the California Highway Patrol.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Good morning. I'm John
21 Fisher, I work for the City of Los Angeles, Department of
22 Transportation, and I represent the League of California
23 Cities Southern Half of the State.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: I'm Deborah Wong with AAA
25 Northern California.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Good morning, I am Jacob
2 Babico, I work for the County of San Bernardino, I represent
3 the Southern California of the CSAC.

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I'm Devinder Singh,
5 working for Caltrans and Secretary of the Committee.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. And it's
7 our tradition that we go through the audience. We want to
8 know who you are and what organization you represent. And
9 in order for us to prioritize the agenda items, so that if
10 there's one person here for a single item, it doesn't wait
11 for an item that has 20 people who want to speak, if you
12 please tell us which item you're here for. If you're just
13 observing, then we thank you for that also.

14 I'm going to start here.

15 (Audience Introductions.)

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, we are
17 going to go through -- we are going to make -- colleagues,
18 if you don't mind, we are going to make a little bit self-
19 adjustment. I see one person only for one item, and two
20 ladies for one item, I really don't want to hold them up for
21 the bicycle timing issue. So, we'll entertain those first
22 and get them off the table, then we'll have the rest of the
23 meeting for the bicycle timing issue.

24 Item No. 2, Approval of Minutes. Have you had a
25 chance to look at the minutes? Now, as you see, we have our

1 Beta minutes, we have a transcriber who takes word by word,
2 be careful what you say. So, you can't say that's not what
3 I said, or have a comment, except if you want to modify your
4 comments you made.

5 Any comments? Any motion to approve the minutes?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So moved.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Second.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There's a motion
9 and second. Anyone in opposition?

10 (No response.)

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Motion passes
12 unanimously.

13 Item No. 3, we don't want to go there. I'm happy
14 doing what I'm doing -- (laughter). No, this is our
15 election time and I'm going to open the floor for
16 nominations. By floor, I mean to the membership, for
17 nomination for a Chairman for next year.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I move John Fisher
19 for Chairman.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There's a motion
21 for John Fisher to be our next Chairman. Is there a second
22 to that motion?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I second.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There's a motion
25 and a second, I close the nomination. All those in favor?

1 Any other nomination?

2 (No response.)

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Seeing none, all
4 those in favor of John Fisher, say aye?

5 (Ayes.)

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Aye. Did you say
7 aye, John?

8 (Laughter.)

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Silently.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. If you say
12 it silently, the motion passes unanimously.

13 Now, we have a motion for Vice Chair.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I move Jacob Babico.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Motion for
16 Mr. Babico as a Vice Chair. A second to that?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Second.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There's a motion
19 and second. Any other nomination?

20 (No response.)

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Seeing none, all
22 those in favor?

23 (Ayes.)

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Aye. Including
25 Mr. Babico himself, right? The motion passes unanimously.

1 So, our new Chairman and Vice Chair will be
2 Mr. Fisher as Chair and Mr. Babico as a Vice Chair. And
3 they will take over now or next meeting?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: What is the protocol?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Next meeting.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, next
7 meeting you take over. Come prepared, bring your own gavel,
8 otherwise I give you this, you know.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Mr. Chairman, I have an
10 item that's not on the agenda but, on behalf of the whole
11 Committee, we wanted to thank you for your service over the
12 last two years as serving as Chair of the Committee. The
13 Committee Chair has quite a balancing act to do, tries to
14 keep the meeting moving, tries to make sure we focus in on
15 the discussion and don't go off on tangents, tries to make
16 sure that all points of view are heard, not only from the
17 Committee Members, but also those visitors who have come to
18 attend the meeting, and tries to make sure that we resolve
19 things in a fair, equitable and manner that stands the test
20 of scrutiny. And so we'd like to thank you for your serving
21 as Chairman over the last two years, and we'd like to
22 present you a plaque that commemorates that appreciation.
23 So, thank you very much.

24 (Applause.)

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you very

1 much. I just wish that you had given me that speech when I
2 took over, because I didn't know I was supposed to do all
3 those things.

4 (Laughter.)

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: But thank you
6 very much, it's very, very kind of you, appreciate it.

7 Okay. Moving on, we go to Public Comments at this
8 time. If there are any members of the public who wish to
9 address the Committee on items that are not on the agenda,
10 but are within the purview of the Committee, this is the
11 time but the Committee will not be able to make any
12 decisions, since it's not on the agenda.

13 Any members of the Public?

14 (No response.)

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Seeing none, we
16 close the Public Comments. Any member comments at this
17 point?

18 (No response.)

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Just something to
20 share, and Mr. Henley and I were discussing it yesterday,
21 the National MUTCD has been adopted for 2009, and over we
22 have two years to adopt the -- re-adopt the manual or go
23 through the California supplement, whatever. Having lived
24 through the adoption of the first MUTCD for the last four
25 and a half and five years, we are glad to have Johnny back

1 there to take on this task also but, we are embarking on
2 another major activity in the Committee and there are going
3 to be workshops and probably more than a regular number of
4 meetings over the next two years.

5 Mr. Henley, do you want to share something?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Actually, I think Johnny
7 was going to mention that near the end of the meeting, what
8 we're going to be doing. So, if you want to just leave it
9 till the end.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, we'll
11 leave it until then.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, let's
14 go first to the Item 08-18, the Proposal to adopt "No Idling
15 Commercial Vehicles & School Buses". This is coming back to
16 us, we visited this a couple of times.

17 Mr. Henley.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. You know, a
19 number of years, about two, three years ago, we had this
20 issue on the Agenda and then it came up and there was, I
21 guess, a discussion, and I think they needed a clearer
22 policy. So, since then the ARB has gotten clearer policy
23 and Nancy O'Connor, I guess, is here and she's going to tell
24 us, you know, what they found and what they'd like to see
25 happen.

1 MS. O'CONNOR: Okay. Actually -- okay -- Hi
2 everybody, I'm Nancy O'Connor from the California Air
3 Resources Board. Thank you for re-hearing this.

4 My predecessor had left before I had a chance to
5 discuss with him what he had done on this proposal. I'm not
6 really sure what it was he wanted to clarify on here. This,
7 the reason I'm here today is almost more a fact finding than
8 it is explaining but, if you guys have questions, I'll be
9 happy to answer them.

10 The proposal, as you know, is for the signage and
11 we have been mandated through the Legislature in AB-233 of
12 2007, to put signage up and down the State on State
13 properties. And I think there was an issue last time
14 regarding places where they could and could not put them, is
15 that correct?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: That's correct.

17 MS. O'CONNOR: Okay. And our current proposal is
18 on State properties like the Highway Patrol at their scales
19 and inspection facilities, on Caltrans owned rest stops,
20 State Parks, Capitol Building, Campuses through the UC
21 System and the CSU System, and State owned buildings and
22 facilities with loading docks. And freeway on and off
23 ramps.

24 Now, are these facilities allowed, where we could
25 place the signage?

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I think, Ms.
2 O'Connor, I think the question, if I recall, and members
3 speak up to refresh my memory because it's been like at
4 least one year where we have looked at this --

5 MS. O'CONNOR: Oh yeah.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And
7 unfortunately, I didn't have a chance to go back and look at
8 all the minutes of those two meetings. I think one of the
9 questions, at least from the members, were some allowance so
10 they can be used on municipality properties also. That they
11 not be restricted only for the State facilities, but if a
12 city or a county decides that they want to use the signs,
13 that they be included also.

14 MS. O'CONNOR: Yeah, actually --

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Right, yeah.

16 MS. O'CONNOR: Okay. Our newest plan on this was
17 actually we've got somebody assigned to actually work with
18 and contact various cities and counties throughout the state
19 and work directly with them. Is that something that we
20 should pursue or is it something we should do a different
21 way, through Caltrans, all work together on one, as one
22 Committee?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, because the
24 idea was that, and again, you know, members jump in,
25 especially representatives of the cities and the counties,

1 was the idea was that the policy intend of the ARB Board
2 was, the California Resource Board, was that if you wanted
3 to improve air quality you have to restrict or eliminate as
4 much as you can idling of commercial vehicles.

5 MS. O'CONNOR: Right.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And so you have
7 to be able to enforce these signs throughout the state.

8 MS. O'CONNOR: Right.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And the stated
10 owned facilities are a small part of the whole state
11 infrastructure, so that -- and not that every city and the
12 county should be obligated to put the signs on and enforce
13 them but being given the option.

14 MS. O'CONNOR: Yes.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Mansourian?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I think one of our
17 issues that we raised was the language AB-233 had, which
18 only specified state properties.

19 MS. O'CONNOR: Right.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: And we were asking
21 for clarification.

22 MS. O'CONNOR: Okay.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The clarification
24 was, does that mean that on non-state, like cities and
25 counties, were not allowed to or -- and that's what we were

1 asking for Air Resources Board to clarify for us.

2 MS. O'CONNOR: I think -- okay --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Because there was an
4 interest on the Committee to do this but, it was beyond the
5 state, and we weren't sure if the AB-233 allows us or not.

6 MS. O'CONNOR: Okay. I think AB-233, when they
7 put out these state facilities, I think they were just
8 giving examples as where they wanted it on state property.
9 But, I will check into that then.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So, that's the
11 clarification.

12 MS. O'CONNOR: Okay.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So, specifically the
14 question is, can we also put these on city and county
15 facilities if they wish to do so.

16 MS. O'CONNOR: Okay.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, and
18 especially since the sign mentions specifically commercial
19 vehicles and school buses, and the majority of the school
20 buses, if they're going to be idling, they're going to be on
21 local jurisdiction properties, not the state properties.

22 MS. O'CONNOR: Right, right, okay. There are a
23 couple of counties in the state, or there's a city, the City
24 of Sacramento and the County of Placer, already have their
25 own ordinances and their own signs, I think. I'm not sure

1 about the signage but, I know they have their own
2 ordinances. And we are going to include them as best we
3 can. We're going to be contacting these cities and counties
4 throughout the state, and we would like to put the signs
5 everywhere that we can.

6 My section is in charge of the enforcement of this
7 regulation and, I've got to tell you, I get more calls from
8 people who have received citations for this and they're
9 angry that there's no sign and no one knew about it. So, I
10 think this is really a very important initiative. But, we
11 were planning on working with them one by one.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: As I recall part of the
14 discussion, when this came up before, I expressed a concern
15 that trying to prohibit idling vehicles might lead some
16 elected officials to say we need it at bus stops, we need it
17 at where tour buses go, we need it wherever trucks
18 congregate, resulting in a signing problem that would not be
19 sustainable for local agencies. So, there were several
20 areas of clarification.

21 One, does this apply only to state owned property?

22 And if not, is it, is this law not a general law that
23 applies throughout California, where if something is
24 automatically prohibited statewide, you don't need signing
25 to prohibit it. It's automatically prohibited.

1 And so I thought the intent was to remind those
2 drivers, on certain state facilities such as the rest stops,
3 just as a reminder to them to be sure not to idle your
4 vehicles here because of the pollution it causes. But, I
5 have to express some concern that if this were to be
6 expanded to say, oh, local jurisdictions can do this as
7 well, then there would be some elected officials seeking
8 easy answers to idling questions, to say we need signs to
9 prohibit the bus in the layover zone from idling, where it's
10 automatically prohibited without signing.

11 MS. O'CONNOR: That's correct, it is prohibited,
12 it is a statewide regulation.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Right.

14 MS. O'CONNOR: And --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So, therefore, you
16 wouldn't have to have a sign --

17 MS. O'CONNOR: No.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: -- to prohibit it --

19 MS. O'CONNOR: Right.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: But it would be used as
21 a reminder, in specific cases, on specific facilities, to
22 let them know be sure not to idle.

23 MS. O'CONNOR: Correct, that is correct.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: And that's why I thought
25 then that the direction was to limit this at those locations

1 where it was most problematic, which was at the rest stops
2 and the other locations that are mentioned here.

3 MS. O'CONNOR: That is correct.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
5 questions from our members?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: This seems to me almost
7 like a no littering type, you know, you put it where you
8 think you have a problem. I think the sign could use some
9 work, you know, maybe I'd like to see -- and another thing
10 is the sign, at least the proposed sign I saw, didn't say
11 anything about diesel. I think this is focused on diesel.

12 MS. O'CONNOR: Actually, the two regulations,
13 there's the commercial vehicle idling, which is aimed
14 directly at diesel vehicles. The school bus idling one
15 though is for any fuel, any vehicle that is carrying school
16 pupils from K through 12 is subject to the regulation for
17 school vehicles. They can only idle five minutes when
18 they're away from a school area. So, if it was a school bus
19 pulling in and it happened to run on gasoline which, you
20 know, is unusual but, if it did, that vehicle can still only
21 idle for five minutes.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: How do you -- I noticed
23 there's like 12 exemptions or something like that, a lot of
24 them.

25 MS. O'CONNOR: Yeah, sure.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: And I'm not sure how we
2 -- we obviously can't convey all those exemptions on a sign.

3 MS. O'CONNOR: No, no, no, it's just a reminder
4 sign for them, as he was saying, you know, to be wary that
5 this regular does exist, and it is enforced.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Chief, what is
7 the CHP's enforcement perspective on this?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: As I was going to say
9 before John basically said it for me, the code does not
10 require that there be a sign present to enforce the statute.

11 It is a law that can be enforced whether it's signed or
12 not. But, what I see is exactly what John was saying, that
13 you, it seems that these would be placed in locations where
14 there is a problem. I think that if you're going to put a
15 sign up, it needs to be as clear as possible what you're
16 aiming at. And Mr. Henley, you brought up that school buses
17 and commercial vehicles but, it's diesel commercial
18 vehicles, so there is that separation.

19 MS. O'CONNOR: Right.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: The way I was reading
21 the request for the signage was that somewhere in the code
22 it talked about that the regulation would include a public
23 outreach effort and would include public education. And I
24 see this as a means to accomplish that. But, as far as the
25 enforcement side of it, whether there's a sign or not, it

1 can be enforced. And in fact, we do, when I was the
2 Commander at the Capitol, we used to go out with ARB, the
3 ARB representatives, issuing citations to the buses idling
4 on 10th Street.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
6 questions?

7 (No response.)

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Hearing none,
9 thank you. We may call you back. I have to open this to
10 public hearing and see if there are any other people who
11 want to talk on this.

12 MS. O'CONNOR: Okay.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. This is a
14 Public Hearing Item, we are going to open it to members of
15 the public. Anybody who wishes to share their views with
16 the Committee on this item?

17 MR. DORINSIDE: Chad Dorinside, Best Highway
18 Safety Practices Institute.

19 This is the classic example of why State
20 Legislature shouldn't be regulating things under Interstate
21 Commerce. How would a person coming in from another state
22 know that this idling law exists? What do you do in places
23 like where I live in Tahoe, where the temperature outside
24 can be ten or 15, or zero degrees? What do you do in areas
25 where the idling is a factor of keeping alive?

1 It's too broad. If the Federal Highway
2 Administration wants to do an idling program with the EPA or
3 whatever, then they should formulate a nationwide standard
4 for all the states to adopt. This ad hoc city by city,
5 county by county, if someone calls and claims they got a
6 ticket because they don't know what the rules are, someone
7 just said there's 12 exceptions, how would anybody know what
8 those 12 exceptions are, even when there are exceptions? In
9 other words, all these traffic control devices have
10 consequences from a legal standpoint, and somebody needs to
11 address those when we're addressing traffic control devices,
12 because the traffic control device doesn't stand out alone,
13 there's an enforcement side, and on the enforcement side it
14 has consequences. And in this particular case, this is an
15 interstate commerce law, period, that affects interstate
16 commerce. Because once you enter a roadway, you're involved
17 in interstate commerce, even if you don't leave the state.

18 And I just think that it needs to be re-thought
19 and then someone needs to figure out with the Feds how it's
20 going to be implemented so all the states do the same thing,
21 so each city and county doesn't have a different rule.
22 There's 80,000 different entities in the United States that
23 have authority over the roadway in some way or another, and
24 there's no way anybody could go from roadway to roadway,
25 city to city, sign to sign, or no sign, and know what

1 standard applies. Thank you.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Than you. You
3 raised some very, very good points but, they're all policy
4 points and this is not a -- we are a technical Committee.
5 Those policy issues have already been decided and debated, I
6 assume by the State Legislature, when they adopted AB-233,
7 and the Air Resources Board when they adopted Section 2480
8 of their policy. Those are good points, but not the purview
9 and the jurisdiction of the Committee. We're only dealing
10 with the sign part of it. Those decisions have already been
11 made by others and we have no authority over them.

12 Anybody else who has a comment on this?

13 (No response.)

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Seeing none,
15 thank you. I close the Public Hearing.

16 Thank you Ms. O'Connor.

17 Mr. Mansourian?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Hearing the Air
19 Resources Board staff and Committee members, you know, this
20 law exists, we don't need a sign, and those who drive these
21 kind of vehicles should know the rule and those who don't,
22 they're going to have to read it once they get a ticket.
23 So, it seems to me one way we can educate is if we come up
24 with a sign, as it's proposed, then as part of the signage,
25 don't we usually come up with words "this is applicable" and

1 what have you, and that's, I think, our way of promoting
2 some rules. Right now, if you look at our staff report,
3 page 12 of 80, it tells you what this is applicable to,
4 which is basically it says diesel fuel, commercial vehicles
5 over 10,000 pounds, and it lists the exceptions. For
6 example, the speaker was saying how about if I need it for
7 heating the car, it says that's exempt but, none of us know.

8 So, I think by coming up with a sign and writing the
9 regulation, it can address what Mr. Chairman, and John, you
10 were talking about. In other words, we bring it from being
11 a hidden law, perhaps into a more education. I can see good
12 application for us in the counties, but right now it's the
13 law and we can do it, and somebody can be cited with no
14 sigh. So, that's why I support doing something, but we just
15 need to make sure that it doesn't become a free for all,
16 because I do share John's concern that this doesn't become
17 for every bus stop.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let me ask
19 Caltrans staff one question. Typically, when a sign comes
20 to us, there is an attached insert in the California MUTCD
21 that addresses all these issues. I don't see that.

22 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: That is on page ten.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, but that is
24 like --

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: At the bottom.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- that's like a
2 very small section and you're not really addressing the
3 issues that Mr. Mansourian brought up. Do we need to
4 expand, or let me ask this actually, it's a question that
5 Devinder brought to my attention. I don't know even if it's
6 the purview of the Air Resources Board to start allowing
7 these things, if the actual 233 language, AB-233 does not
8 mention it, and it says the state, then technically it
9 becomes like a state facility sign. I don't know if it's
10 something done administratively or the Air Quality -- or Air
11 Resources Board can make that decision, or you need to get
12 modifying legislative language to allow the use of this for
13 municipalities?

14 MS. O'CONNOR: For what? I'm sorry.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Because the
16 language AB-233 specifically says the state. Could you come
17 to the podium because he is recording, he is not going to be
18 able to hear it.

19 MS. O'CONNOR: Okay.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You just said
21 that the AB-233, it says state facilities.

22 MS. O'CONNOR: Yes.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, does that
24 kind of preclude already the other municipalities, or do you
25 need modifying legislative or -- legislative language?

1 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, what it says is kind of
2 loose. It says, "The education and outreach component shall
3 include the placement of signs and other materials in
4 multiple languages where appropriate, in locations where
5 significant numbers of idling trucks and engines have been
6 found, especially locations near schools and residential
7 communities." And residential communities to me would be
8 communities, I mean other than state facilities. "To ensure
9 that operators of trucks traveling through the state and
10 other affected individuals and businesses are aware of the
11 state diesel engine idling requirements."

12 So, I think it's pretty loose. I think we can put
13 it, you know, anywhere where it's allowable.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I had a question. It
16 sounds like there's two issues, one is this action by the
17 Board to promote the public education process on state
18 facilities but, in reading the actual code, there's nothing
19 in the code that calls out state only facilities. So, it
20 looks like it applies throughout the state and then this is
21 just a separate issue where they want to use the sign for
22 public education purposes. So, I mean there's nothing in
23 the code that would prohibit us from using this for roadways
24 and local agencies.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I know, but the

1 support language in the section kind of says state owned
2 properties, it kind of makes it confusing.

3 Let me ask you this, Mr. Henley, do you think this
4 is ready for the Committee to make a decision or do you want
5 to rehash these issues with the Air Resources Board staff
6 and bring it back?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: At the very least, we
8 need to take a look at that sign.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: So, I think we basically
11 should bring it back for a final decision at the next
12 meeting.

13 MS. O'CONNOR: Okay. I have no problem with doing
14 anything to that sign. That was just a, you know, something
15 to throw out there. We're not sign designers and maybe you
16 have some expertise --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: We'll help you with
18 this.

19 MS. O'CONNOR: -- expertise on that would be
20 appreciated.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: We don't want to
22 unduly delay items, and this has been on our agenda for at
23 least a year, year and a half, a good year.

24 MS. O'CONNOR: That was actually partly our fault.
25 And we had to -- we were waiting for a legislative change

1 proposal to come through. We were trying to change some of
2 the vehicle codes to allow local police and CHP to more
3 easily enforce this regulation, because they have the
4 authority to enforce it in the regulation but, they don't
5 have a good vehicle code with a, you know, a bail schedule
6 so, they tend not to enforce this one. So, we were waiting
7 for the Legislative change proposal but, you know, with the
8 fiscal year the way it's been going, it's just been
9 languishing so, we just decided to go ahead with it without
10 and just use the regulation for the state.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, yeah, I think you
13 must touched on the point I wanted to raise. If a local
14 jurisdiction wanted to post signs, and wanted to enforce it,
15 usually they look to the Vehicle Code to see what infraction
16 there is. And so I wanted to ask the Highway Patrol, as
17 well as you, how could they cite some Air Resources Code as
18 being in violation of a rule of the road?

19 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, they have done it. There's a
20 couple of Vehicle Codes that are in there that can kind of
21 work but, they're kind of a stretch. And right now, they're
22 not actively enforcing it. They can enforce other things
23 though, like for example, if there's a vehicle park, you
24 know, you see vehicles pull in, the trucks that are carrying
25 all the new cars, a lot of times they like to park in the

1 center lane there and idle while they're unloading
2 everything, they're not supposed to do that, they can cite
3 for that, or if you have, you know, --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: They can cite what code
5 for that?

6 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, I don't know the code right
7 off the top of my head, I could get that for you.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, but I'd like to
9 ask the Highway Patrol --

10 MS. O'CONNOR: There's -- they can't idle in the
11 center lane --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: -- how you handle that?

13 MS. O'CONNOR: -- of a roadway.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Right.

15 MS. O'CONNOR: So, there are codes but they're not
16 good codes. It's difficult for Police to enforce this, and
17 that was what our Legislative change proposal was about.
18 However, our agency has our own inspectors who go up and
19 down the state all the time, day after day, and they write
20 citations for this. And this is where people will call up
21 and they -- some have never heard of the regulations, and
22 thought that maybe they could idle at the rest area, because
23 it's a rest area, so the signage is needed. But, as far as
24 who can enforce it? It can be enforced by our state
25 inspectors, it can be enforced by local Air District

1 inspectors, and they can actually cite from this code, from
2 13 CCR 2485. The only people who are having difficulty
3 enforcing this right now are local law enforcement.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: And we can cite for CCR
5 violations. When we talk about it not being a good code or
6 a good section, I think may be cumbersome or straightforward
7 is maybe a better way to describe it.

8 MS. O'CONNOR: Okay. But not impossible.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: There's a roundabout
10 way you have to go about issuing a citation, by referencing
11 the CCR and referencing your authority to cite the CCR, it's
12 a more cumbersome process to actually issue the violation
13 but, we have the authority to do it.

14 I think, it seems to me what is before this
15 Committee or what our purview is, kind of responding to the
16 other speaker's comments, was the law is in effect and there
17 seems to be a requirement or a desire to be able to post
18 signs. So, we need to be able to approve some verbiage on
19 the signs and make a determination on where those would be
20 allowed or not be allowed to be posted. But then, just like
21 Mr. Fisher said, if it's an approved sign, then the locals
22 are going to put it up where they feel it's necessary,
23 right, once it's an approved sign.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Once it is an approved
25 sign, there will be pressure to put it up at many school

1 zones, bus stops, etcetera, layover zones.

2 Having heard the comments that there isn't really
3 yet a Vehicle Code section, therefore there's not a citation
4 associated with this, with the bail associated with it, I'd
5 like to be supportive of helping the Air Resources Board
6 remind motorists at specific facilities, you know, that
7 idling is in violation with the statewide law. But, it
8 seems like until we get something into the Vehicle Code, it
9 would be best then to keep this off street, like at your
10 rest stops --

11 MS. O'CONNOR: They get cited --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: -- and places like that,
13 and let you enforce it, rather than releasing it to the
14 Police and Traffic Officers who don't really have anything
15 to cite yet.

16 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, they can cite it but, this
17 really isn't for the Police, it's for the Air District
18 inspectors and for the Air Resources. We are out -- we
19 write a lot of citations.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Right, but if local
21 jurisdiction start installing these signs, then you would
22 expect the Police to enforce it, and they're oblivious to
23 this, because you're the best enforcement entity. So,
24 that's why I would support keeping this on the specific off
25 street sites to allow you to remind drivers not to idle.

1 But, I do have some concerns about expanding this to city
2 streets, since it is a statewide law, at this time.

3 MS. O'CONNOR: I believe, though, that the
4 Legislative change proposal will eventually be accepted, and
5 it will make it, and they will be having this authority to
6 write the citations easily.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: At that time then maybe,
8 you know, one option, Mr. Chairman, is to kind of restrict
9 it to just the off street statewide facilities as proposed
10 here, and then at such time that this -- there's a change in
11 the Vehicle Code, to see how well this has been working and
12 to see if we want to then expand this to remind drivers on
13 city streets of this restriction. I just think maybe we're
14 getting a little bit ahead of ourselves.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

16 Jeff?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I did want to
18 point out that it would be very helpful for me, as a Traffic
19 Engineer, to have a standardized regulatory sign, simply
20 because many cities like ours have municipal ordinances that
21 allow for the enforcement of regulatory signs. And quite
22 often my officers, when they want to give out a slightly
23 less expensive ticket, in fact will write for the sign
24 violation rather than the Vehicle Code violation, because it
25 actually comes with lesser penalties but still does the

1 education that we want it to do. So, but the main need I
2 have, because I do get these requests, is for an official
3 sign format, so we're not having to make something up.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, does the Vehicle
5 Code give local jurisdictions the authority to enforce this
6 type of restriction? I don't think it does yet.

7 MS. O'CONNOR: It's actually -- their authority is
8 in the regulation, it's in the state regulation.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: It's right here.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay, point it out to
11 me.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: It gives the authority
13 to Air Resources Board and Peace Officers, Section 830.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Which covers all local,
16 state law enforcement.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Moving on,
19 any other comments or questions from any members?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well, you know, it looks
21 like, you know, the proposed language for the MUTCD covers
22 where we are right now, as far as this is basically putting
23 signs, if we agree, on state property. Now, like in
24 Sacramento County, you say the County or the City has said
25 you can do it all over the City so, I guess you could put

1 them on the -- but according to this, you can put them on
2 state property, not on the city street. And of course most
3 of us have parked around the Capitol, well, we aren't on
4 state property, we're on a city street, so I don't know how
5 you deal with that issue.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, the CCR
7 violations, you know, that all the local law enforcement
8 agencies, they use that if they want, the CHP does. But,
9 the way that the language is now, it very specifically,
10 because the standard just says that it has to be within 100
11 feet of the area but, the support language very specifically
12 restricts the use for the state property. So, the question
13 I think to the Committee, I don't know if you want actually
14 a vote today or if you want some feedback from the Committee
15 on the language and on the sign itself, and then you work it
16 with the Air Resources Board, the staff, and bring it back.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Does the Committee feel
18 like it needs to see this again?

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Chief?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Mr. Chair, my question
21 I guess is just, if this is statewide law and if it is
22 applicable everywhere, and I realize the support language
23 that's written here, which is drafted by someone at some
24 point, but do we have the ability in this Committee to
25 recommend only allowing a sign that advertises statewide law

1 on specific locations?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Good question.
3 If the state law is the way that you say, that your
4 inspectors are going up and down the state --

5 MS. O'CONNOR: Everywhere.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- regardless
7 where they are, they could be sitting in a shopping center,
8 for all we know, on private property, and still they get a
9 ticket from the Air Resources Board, then is that the
10 purview of the Committee to say that the sign shall be
11 erected only on state property?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yes, we are.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Because of the
15 Assembly Bill that has been passed. If that wasn't the
16 case, no, but the Assembly Bill says only on state property,
17 and state is saying we cannot put up a sign on a state
18 highway.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's not what
20 she said.

21 MS. O'CONNOR: Actually, it says residential
22 communities.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's not what
24 she said. She said residential communities.

25 MS. O'CONNOR: AB-233 says residential

1 communities.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, so the --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: What page are you
4 on?

5 MS. O'CONNOR: I'm on -- well -- actually, I'm
6 reading from my own proposal that I brought with me. I'm
7 not sure if you have -- if you would like to --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Your letter of
9 January 21st, second paragraph from the bottom, "These signs
10 need to be strategically placed at state owned properties."

11 MS. O'CONNOR: Okay. Well, when we --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: That's what you
13 signed.

14 MS. O'CONNOR: Yes, I did. And the reason for
15 that was, is we were going to work individually with the
16 communities, and so when we were talking about coming here,
17 we were really only concerned with state owned properties.
18 I wasn't aware that the support language only said state.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. We have
20 spent 45 minutes on this issue. I thought this was going to
21 be much faster.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I don't think this
23 is ready, because I don't think there is an adequate
24 communication between Air Resources Board and State.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah. It may be

1 better if we bring this back, if it doesn't hamper your
2 efforts, or your efforts --

3 MS. O'CONNOR: No, that's fine, I have no problem.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: If you have the
5 time, well, we might suggest to see how the rest of you guys
6 think about it. If you go back and, first of all, get
7 clarification on the AB-233, is that restricting? Because
8 if the Legislative has said state property only, there's no
9 way that this Committee is allowed to say you can put it
10 wherever. So, we have to implement the State Legislature's
11 wish.

12 The second thing is just look at the sign and
13 helping with the design of the signage. Do you guys have
14 any comment on the sign, before they go back and work the
15 sign, on the sign specific, regardless of where we put it?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: You mean the one on page
17 11?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, the page
19 11.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, the sign is very
21 generic, it says commercial vehicles. It could be UPS
22 trucks with four wheels, it could be 10,000 pound trucks, 18
23 wheelers. Are these covered as commercial?

24 MS. O'CONNOR: Yes. Commercial --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But in places you said

1 10,000 pounds.

2 MS. O'CONNOR: The regulation for commercial
3 vehicle idling is specific to vehicles with a gross vehicle
4 weight rating of 10,000 pounds or above.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But the sign doesn't say
6 that, it just says commercial vehicle.

7 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, when you're talking about
8 school buses --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I'm talking about the
10 sign.

11 MS. O'CONNOR: Right.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, are you
13 suggesting that a weight number be added to the sign?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, you need to be --
15 to clarify it, I mean is that for five tons and over or not?

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Any other
17 thoughts or suggestions? Deborah?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Yeah, I also have a
19 question about diesel, is it just for diesel?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah.

21 MS. O'CONNOR: No.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: No.

23 MS. O'CONNOR: It's not, because the school bus
24 idling regulation is for all fuels. The only vehicle that's
25 exempt from the school bus idling regulation is an electric

1 vehicle, or any --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: What about natural gas?

3 MS. O'CONNOR: Natural gas is subject to it.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well, you know, as I
5 said, because of the number of exceptions, I think a generic
6 sign is more appropriate than trying to cover every possible
7 contingency. So, I think something like idling and then
8 maybe a little prohibition, you know, those little circles
9 with the idling and then the red cross across it or
10 something so that it's ah, maybe I shouldn't be idling.
11 But, you know, if they think they know the law and they
12 know they're exempt, then they can just keep on right
13 idling.

14 MS. O'CONNOR: Right. I've seen that actually in
15 other states. We're not the only state that has this
16 regulation, there's a number of others.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Is this sign
18 prepared by Caltrans's staff or --

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, this is a just a
20 mockup --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: This is a quick mockup.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: It can be modified as
23 suggested by the Committee.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
25 suggestions on the sign? The language, I don't think we are

1 ready until we hear the clarification on the legal issue.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'd like to get some
3 feedback on that concept for a sign, because I don't want to
4 bring a sign back and then, you know, argue at another
5 meeting.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah. So,
7 Mr. Babico has made a comment that since this sign and this
8 law applies to vehicles only over 10,000 pounds, maybe the
9 sign has to say so. That's one comment.

10 Any other comments on the sign?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: One comment I have is
12 the size of the lettering. This is for a stopped vehicles,
13 because on freeway or on state route the four inch size of
14 regulatory sign, I think is substandard or something. They
15 cannot read it unless they park or they stop. And the
16 reflective sheeting doesn't need to be more than engineering
17 grade, because it's at stop condition, or parked condition.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Those are
19 our comments for Caltrans and ARB staff.

20 Mr. Mansourian?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: To followup what
22 Jacob says, I'm now more confused, because on page 12 of the
23 staff report it cites the CCR Title 13, and it shows exactly
24 what is applicable here. And it's very specific, and it is
25 diesel fueled commercial vehicle 10,000 pounds. So, it's

1 talking about, you know, a capacity and a type of -- but
2 Nancy, you are saying no, it's applicable to everything.
3 So, what I'd like to see is a clarification. If it is
4 10,000 pounds, then the sign needs to refer to that, that's
5 my feedback for the sign. If it is not 10,000 pounds, and
6 this is applicable to any commercial vehicle that cannot
7 idle, then we can leave it general. That's my feedback.
8 But, we need to clarify that, because to me a commercial
9 vehicle is any vehicle that has a commercial license.

10 MS. O'CONNOR: Right.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: And commercial
12 license can be any delivery --

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It's a taxi cab.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Correct. So, that's
15 where my feedback for the sign is, it depends on what is
16 really the law. So, I appreciate hearing a relationship
17 between these two at our next meeting. Thank you.

18 MS. O'CONNOR: Okay.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And the type of
20 fuel as well.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Correct.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Ms. Wong?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Well, it seems that the
24 commercial vehicles are diesel only, and it's a little
25 confusing. I wonder if there should be two signs, because

1 they won't really be used in the same places. So, no idling
2 school buses used, you know, on the school grounds and at
3 campuses, and the commercial vehicles at the rest stops and
4 other places, that there could be two separate signs.

5 That's my comment.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
7 comments? Mr. Fisher?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Just a final question
9 for the lady from the Air Resources Board.

10 Given that you've got a public information
11 campaign out to the drivers of school buses and commercial
12 vehicles, why do you think you need a sign?

13 MS. O'CONNOR: Well we're still not getting to
14 everybody, and I know this because of the feedback I get on
15 the phone when people call in after they've been cited by
16 this regulation. And numerous cities have asked for signs,
17 and they're angry that there aren't signs. And we have done
18 a lot of outreach, we have visited a lot of businesses,
19 we've gone to association meetings, we've worked extensively
20 with the California Trucking Association, we are constantly
21 handing out information about this regulation, and have but,
22 we're still just not getting to everybody. We've even got
23 -- it's even in the commercial driver handbook, every
24 commercial driver is supposed to read that book and on page
25 eight of that book it talks about the idling regulation.

1 I don't know why people still don't know. Most,
2 if it's a long haul trucker, they know, that groups knows.
3 They go to -- they belong to associations, they talk to each
4 other at truck stops. The people that don't know are the
5 delivery drivers. And most delivery vehicles are over
6 10,000 pounds. Even the little small ones are usually
7 around 15, like a Federal Express van, that's over 10,000,
8 UPS drivers, those are all over 10,000. Those people
9 though, like for Fed Ex and UPS, they've been instructed by
10 their company not to idle. They're not the ones we're
11 worried about. It's the little, the driver who leaves his
12 house and he goes to work, and he gets in his truck and he's
13 in Sacramento and he drives to Reno and back every day, he
14 doesn't hang out with other truck drivers, you know, he
15 comes back to the yard, he gets in his car and he goes home.
16 Those are the people that actually don't know and would
17 really benefit by this sign. Some of the long haul truckers
18 still don't know.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So, you think having a
20 sign wherever this independent truck driver may load, would
21 be more effective than some outreach effort?

22 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, it would be best if they read
23 the Commercial Driver Handbook.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Well, I'm sure
25 they read the Commercial Driver Handbook as much as we all

1 read the Driver Handbook that the DMV puts out.

2 MS. O'CONNOR: Exactly. I don't know how else to
3 get his information out. They've done mass mailings. I
4 don't know. Anyway --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well, you're educating
6 them one at a time as they get a ticket. You know what, I
7 hate to see a proliferation of more signs basically
8 educating people to follow the law. I mean this is just one
9 law of many laws and every law that's violated, you can see
10 our highways, you know, they're already bad enough as it is,
11 with more signs.

12 MS. O'CONNOR: Well, one of the other, one of the
13 main reasons I'm here is because of AB-233.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I hear you.
15 Okay. So, any other comments on the sign itself?

16 (No response.)

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. We heard a
18 few and you heard it, and counsel has heard it, you've got
19 the concerns and suggestions that members have, and then the
20 question about the policy issue and what the law actually
21 says.

22 MS. O'CONNOR: Okay. We'll work on this.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, you'll come
24 back. Okay, that's it.

25 MS. O'CONNOR: Thank you.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you.

2 Okay. Thanks, Ms. O'Connor.

3 Okay. Let's go to -- you know what, there was one
4 gentleman from City of Riverside, let's go to his item so he
5 can go back and do what he wants to do.

6 Item 10-3, Experiment with Second Training Warning
7 Sign "Additional Train May Approach" with a symbol sign, as
8 submitted by the City of Riverside, and sponsored by
9 Mr. Fisher.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yes, thank you. We
11 received a communication from the City of Riverside, and we
12 have here Gil Hernandez, who will brief us on the situation
13 they have where they have pedestrians crossing two sets of
14 tracks and there's a possibility that the pedestrian seeing
15 one train pass may not be fully aware that there could be
16 another train shortly behind. And they identified this as a
17 hazardous situation.

18 The City of Riverside does have Federal approval
19 from the FHWA to test this sign. So, I'll let
20 Mr. Hernandez tell you more about this.

21 MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman and members of the
22 CTCDC Committee, that was the case -- that is the case in
23 Riverside. Riverside has a multiple at grade crossings. In
24 April of last year, unfortunately there was a freshman that
25 did just that, he looked to his left, saw the train coming,

1 as soon as that train passed he looked, you know, he
2 basically, we're assuming he looked to the ground and
3 started crossing, and although the roadway did have the
4 arms, the sidewalk did not and when he crossed he didn't see
5 that there was another Metrolink train coming in the
6 opposing direction, and that was the train that cost him his
7 life. Because of that, there was a lot of outreach to the
8 city by the residents, asking us to look at the situation
9 and, again, because we have multiple crossings, they wanted
10 us to come up with a solution or some type of educational
11 program to go ahead and remind the students, remind the
12 pedestrians, bicyclists, of this situation.

13 With that, we know we did look at the MUTCD, at
14 the guidelines, to do a, you know, a custom sign request,
15 and with that we did start with FHWA. We went through
16 several rounds of design of the sign and we went ahead and
17 actually even did a study. And based on that study, I think
18 before you is a sign that the City of Riverside recommends
19 the CTCDC to approve.

20 In addition, I know I had emailed Mr. Singh, and
21 FHWA would also like us to do a second sign, very similar to
22 the one being proposed, except without the words "Additional
23 Trains May Approach". And I have a copy here, I have
24 several copies if the Committee would like to review it.
25 And attached to it is also the FHWA's approval saying for us

1 to go ahead, if the CTCDC approves, for us to do basically
2 two signs, you know, as far as the study.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, you're saying
4 the sign has no words, has the word actually, has only one
5 word that says "Look", but it doesn't say "Additional Trains
6 May Approach". Is that what the FHWA prefers or is just --

7 MR. HERNANDEZ: Actually, based on our study the
8 "Additional Trains May Approach" is more effective, you
9 know, most of the students, most of the people we talked to,
10 they prefer that sign. And FHWA is okay with us going ahead
11 forward with that study but, in addition, they also said,
12 you know what, while you're doing the study can you also
13 possibly install this sign at two or three locations, and
14 see what kind of feedback you get. Because one of the
15 things they wanted to do, or wanted to get at least some
16 data back on was, is a sign, a simpler sign as effective.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, your options
18 are pretty much presented, you have four proposals on page
19 61, and is that your proposal to experiment with all those
20 four?

21 MR. HERNANDEZ: No, no. The proposal, again, we
22 have two recommendations from FHWA, and those two
23 recommendations are the ones that the City of Riverside is
24 willing and wanting to implement, which is "Additional
25 Trains May Approach" with a "Look" and an arrow, which again

1 FHWA went ahead and approved. And the second one that they
2 went ahead and emailed the City with the second request, and
3 that again is this sign.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And they're both
5 black on yellow in diamond shape.

6 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, both, yes.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Because you're
8 showing a rectangular --

9 MR. HERNANDEZ: Right. And that actually is a
10 supporting documents, obviously those were the signs when we
11 went out for the study, we presented to the public.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

13 MR. HERNANDEZ: And based on their feedback,
14 again, we narrowed it down actually to one. And again,
15 because of FHWA's request, you know, we're willing to do
16 two, two signs.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.

18 Any questions from Mr. Hernandez?

19 (No response.)

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Seeing none, I'm
21 going to open it to members of the public. Any member of
22 the public who wishes to address the Committee on this item?

23 Yes? We have two actually. You go first and then
24 Chad.

25 MR. LEONE: Robert Leone, San Diego County Bicycle

1 Coalition, Member of the Board of Directors. I like the
2 idea of using this as an experiment. I'm sure the San Diego
3 Trolley has better statistics on this but, since I've been
4 watching carefully newspaper reports in the area of
5 accidents, it seems that at least half, but definitely a
6 significant proportion of bicyclists and pedestrian versus
7 trolley accidents were caused by the second train. Most of
8 the trolley platforms, and a lot of the trolley tracks, for
9 our light rail system here, are double track or even more.
10 So, it's just -- people are getting gotten by the second
11 trolley. So, this is definitely something I would look
12 forward to seeing the experimental data on.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you,
14 Mr. Leone.

15 Chad?

16 MR. DORINSIDE: Chad Dorinside, Best Highway
17 Safety Practices Institute. The only thing I would
18 recommend would be we maintain consistency and keep the
19 diamond shape rather than rectangular shape, because the
20 rectangular shape is not a warning device. And I understand
21 when the Feds want to use the simpler pictograph, because
22 the two arrows gives the bi-directional indication, the
23 look, gives it in English but there's a lot of other
24 languages involved here. So, that's all.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you. Any

1 other members of the public?

2 (No response.)

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Seeing none, I'll
4 close the public hearing part and bring it back to the
5 Committee.

6 So, do you have any questions, comments or
7 motions?

8 Mr. Babico?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: One question to
10 Mr. Hernandez. What kind of controls do you have for the
11 traffic at this location, and can that be implemented
12 similar to the pedestrians as well as bicyclists on the
13 sidewalk?

14 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay, good question. Most at
15 grade crossings have the arms for the vehicle, that is not
16 an issue. I think, you know, the issue is for the
17 pedestrians. Many of these systems are older systems and
18 they do not include pedestrian gates. Obviously at most of
19 these locations it's not feasible or, in a lot of cases, we
20 don't have possibly the numbers of pedestrians there to
21 warrant pedestrian gates. I know, you know, the CPAC, I
22 think one of their new standards is all new crossings will
23 now have pedestrian gates, especially if you have sidewalks.
24 But, again, you know, I want to say the City of Riverside
25 has about 15 at grade crossings so, it's a significant

1 number and something like this, especially in an
2 experimental phase, I think it's easy to implement, quick to
3 implement and again, we're hoping that that will help
4 educate the public. And we feel it's going to be, it's
5 going to improve safety and again, hopefully decrease these
6 types of incidents.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
8 questions? Mr. Knowles?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah, it just had to do
10 with exactly where is the sign placed such that it doesn't
11 block the view of the motorists looking at the railroad
12 sign. I see there's text saying, if you're using the
13 smaller sign so as not to interfere with vehicular
14 visibility but, still where it's shown on the diagram on
15 page 59, I don't see where you're placing it such that it
16 doesn't in some way distract the driver from the standard
17 railroad flashing red lights.

18 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay, good question. You know,
19 that is something obviously that was brought up early in the
20 stages, especially when we met with CPAC, BNSF and Union
21 Pacific. One of the things we went out there trying to set
22 some signs, especially at this location, to show CPAC and
23 Union Pacific where they would stand, where they would be.
24 And basically one of the things we're proposing is, again,
25 only on one side of the sidewalk, more so away from traffic,

1 it's going to be a smaller sign intended just for
2 pedestrians and bicyclists, and again, being that it's going
3 to be further away from the, you know, from the curb, you
4 know, most of these locations have parkways so, again, you
5 have to consider the length of the parkway or the width of
6 the parkway, the width of the sidewalk, and again it's only
7 going to be on one side of the sidewalk as opposed to both
8 sides. And again, that's the one, you know, that's the one
9 when you're riding with traffic. Coming against traffic,
10 you're only going to see the back side of that sign, again,
11 it shouldn't be capturing your attention as a motorist.

12 And again, we're going to be looking at each
13 location individually, obviously, and, you know, we're going
14 to be working with UNSF and UP specifically, to ensure that
15 the sight distance is not being obstructed for the motorist.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And of course if
17 this sign becomes standard some day, then Caltrans is going
18 to develop a much more detailed installation diagram.

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: And that was one of the things we
20 looked at, because a lot of states actually have implemented
21 similar signs, and FHWA actually liked the idea of
22 standardizing the signs in not only California but, like you
23 mentioned, if and when MUTCD does adopt it, other states
24 would also standardize this type of sign.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Knowles?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I'm trying to
2 interpret the diagram on page 59, but there's not an issue
3 of the visibility of the standard railroad crossing but,
4 placing the sign, I would think, where bicycles and
5 pedestrians are most likely to stop and wait for a passing
6 train, so that they're then reminded to look for the second
7 train, which would actually be beyond the railroad gate,
8 since traffic is stopped by the railroad gate, I wouldn't
9 think that that's where I would stop as a pedestrian, back
10 where I would be facing the sign as it's depicted in Exhibit
11 A on page 59.

12 So, I was just wondering, do you have a plan ten
13 feet from the railroad tracks, 20 feet from the railroad
14 tracks? I understand what you're saying about, you know,
15 farther from the curb but, where --

16 MR. HERNANDEZ: In relation to the tracks.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Correct.

18 MR. HERNANDEZ: You know, again, that's not
19 something that we've narrowed down, whether it's five feet,
20 ten feet, whether we're going to be putting in some type of
21 limit line on the sidewalk, that eventually maybe we do go
22 in that direction but right now it's more so to educate the
23 public, more so to make sure they look both directions
24 before they get to the tracks. Obviously, you know, we
25 think maybe ten, 15 feet away from the first track is

1 somewhat appropriate. And again, it's more to educate,
2 more, you know, again, just to let them, inform the public,
3 you know, kind of look both ways, because again it's that
4 second train a lot of times which is being obstructed by the
5 first train, even though that second train, they may look to
6 the right but, if that first train is just past the tracks
7 and then you do look to the right, depending on the height
8 of the train, again it may obstruct the view of the second
9 train approaching. So, you know, again just to make them
10 more not only look both ways but, again, be aware that there
11 may be a train on the other side, on the other track.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Babico?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: A followup to what
14 Jeff's concern is, now at the pedestrian, where the tracks
15 crosses the sidewalks, is there a cross box?

16 MR. HERNANDEZ: Is there a what?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Cross box, a railroad
18 crossing?

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, there is.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. Now, if that is
21 there, there should be a railroad limit line too on the
22 sidewalk, or not?

23 MR. HERNANDEZ: There isn't.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: There's nothing?

25 MR. HERNANDEZ: Not on the sidewalk.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Then your proposed signs
2 will be five feet away from the cross spot?

3 MR. HERNANDEZ: Again, we haven't determined that
4 distance.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: What I'm saying is that
6 the cross box is about two feet from the nearest track,
7 railroad track, approximately.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Fifteen.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Fifteen? No, it has to
10 be very near. That is a gate we are talking.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well the gates --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, I'm talking about
13 the cross box.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Well, at this
15 time if I may just say something. At this time the request
16 for experimentation does not have detailed field
17 implementation language or diagrams. I don't know if you
18 want to design it here. If he feels it's something that the
19 Committee must have before we approve their experimentation,
20 then we can ask the applicant to go back and develop those
21 diagrams and bring it back as part of their application.
22 Otherwise, at this time, you're only looking at authorizing
23 the experimentation with the two signs. But, if you feel
24 that you want to have all that information before you
25 authorize it, by all means, I'm not saying we shouldn't but,

1 we are not going to get into the feet by feet decision here.

2 Mr. Fisher?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yeah. I'd like to point
4 out that I think what's presented here is a low cost
5 measure, a quick fix, maybe an interim measure, something
6 that you can do immediately while maybe you're working at
7 getting funding to put in something more permanent and more
8 positive, such as a pedestrian gate, or such as an activated
9 blank out sign that would positively tell you when indeed
10 the second train is coming. This just tells you to be alert
11 and be aware of it. And I think because the FHWA has
12 already authorized this sign, what the City of Riverside is
13 coming here to us for is just to advise us, so that they can
14 install it in the State of California.

15 So, while I would like to see something more
16 permanent or while maybe we might have seen other designs
17 for the pictograph, I think it's already gone as far as it
18 can go with the Feds, and therefore I move that we approve
19 the experiment as proposed.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Do you have a
21 question?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Just one more --

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let me see, I
24 guess he made a motion --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Second.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. There's a
2 motion and a second. Now discussion, Chief.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Just a quick technical
4 question. If we are approving the request for
5 experimentation, does that -- are we supposed to assign some
6 kind of an end date so we get some kind of report date?

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, of course.
8 We have very specific experimentation policy procedures
9 that's on our website by the way.

10 Mr. Mansourian?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yes, I support, and
12 I want to make sure, I realize the problem, I agree we need
13 to do something, yet that it's a short term solution. I'm
14 on page 61, so we're approving Sign No. 3, I want to make
15 sure that's what we're voting on, John?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yes.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Sign No. 3 and
18 Sign No. 1.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: And Sign No. 1.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Okay. Sign No. 1,
21 for me, as a person who didn't know about this problem, when
22 I first looked at Sign No. 1, I have no clue what it is.
23 So, if you have me look at this sign, I have no clue what it
24 is, I would be crossing the track. And if it's going to be
25 smaller, because you said the size is going to be smaller, I

1 have no idea. So, as a tourist in your town, I would be
2 nailed by whatever it is you're trying to tell me.

3 No. 3, assuming I read English, it's a very good
4 sign buy, I have no problem with No. 1, I just wanted to
5 give you instant outsider feedback, I don't know what it is.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And I think he
7 said that their preference is No. 3 but (indiscernible) has
8 asked them to look at both, if possible.

9 MR. HERNANDEZ: Correct. I think if, you know,
10 our data, our initial data mentioned that about 62 percent
11 fully understood Sign No. 3, compared to about 18 percent of
12 the people we talked to fully understood Sign No. 1 so, you
13 know, we wholeheartedly agree with you that Sign No. 3 is a
14 better sign.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: How many
16 locations are you going to install each of these?

17 MR. HERNANDEZ: We're proposing to do all at
18 grade, so I want to say about 15.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Fifteen. And
20 then you're going to --

21 MR. HERNANDEZ: Actually, I take it back, two of
22 them are under -- being grade separated, so.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, 13, and
24 you're going to install half No. 1, half No. 3 and then
25 compare, is that what you do?

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: We haven't determined the number,
2 we were hoping more like nine and four, since we think that
3 Sign No. 3 is a little more, would be more effective,
4 especially near school sites or where we have a lot of
5 pedestrian crossings.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And to address
7 Chief's question, what is your time line, when are you
8 reporting back to the Committee?

9 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, actually we told FHWA we
10 would provide them with six month, you know, six month
11 interval type studies for the duration of the experiment and
12 we would be happy to show that same information with the
13 CTCDC.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
15 questions or comments? We have a motion and a second that
16 we approve the City of Riverside's request for
17 experimentation with Signs No. 1 and No. 3 at about 13 to 15
18 locations and report back in about six to nine months. Do
19 you want to vote? All those in favor?

20 (Ayes.)

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Opposition?

22 (No response.)

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Motion is passed
24 unanimously. Thank you, Mr. Hernandez.

25 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Good luck with
2 the project.

3 We go back to Item 09-23, Proposal to Adopt NO
4 PARKING SIGNS DURING School days to California MUTCD Section
5 2B.39, requested by County of San Bernardino.

6 Mr. Babico?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yes. Just a brief of
8 the case we had, and we discussed it last CTCDC meeting,
9 that we have a situation where an elementary school is
10 positioned or built on the south side of the street and the
11 north side is a subdivision for residential development, and
12 the parents of the students, as well as the (indiscernible),
13 they park on the residential side and the school requested,
14 and the city, because the north side is the city and the
15 south side is the county, to put a No Parking signs, or say
16 not full time No Parking signs but, limited hours of No
17 Parking. And taking advantage or limiting, as you know, the
18 prohibiting parking is a very sensitive issue, especially in
19 residential area. So, to do so we said, why can't we have
20 to propose a sign that says No Parking between this hour and
21 that hour, the morning, the afternoon, and only during the
22 school days.

23 During the discussion last time, the Chairman and
24 other members argued saying that how a person outside the
25 community would know whether the school is in session or

1 not. Then we have to be more specific. I agree with that.

2 For that reason, the suggestion was I have to come back,
3 propose some other language on the signs, which is depicted
4 on page 23. One of them says the morning and the afternoon
5 hours, school days and it says September to June, because
6 usually the school sessions are between September and June.

7 The other one with a double arrow, and the other one is no
8 stopping, again morning and afternoon hours during school
9 days September to June and so on and so forth.

10 In addition to that, when looking at the policy of
11 the existing signs we have for this particular use, in
12 particular Section 2B.39 -- yeah, 2B.39, there is an option
13 that says, "Limited time parking restrictions may be
14 initiated by local authorities and approved by the
15 department." I question the word underlying "department",
16 which department is that? Does that mean State Department?

17 Why should State Department be involved in local
18 jurisdiction?

19 And then it says, "Parking prohibition between
20 certain hours may also be initiated by local authorities."
21 So, I revised it as shown on page 22. And then the standard
22 reads, "Before time limit parking regulations are approved
23 in rural areas, assurance shall be obtained from the
24 enforcement agencies." And I don't see that, why do we need
25 that to go to the local city PDs or CHPDs to get the

1 approval for the signs that we would like to impose, where
2 it has a limited hours. So, for that reason, I suggested to
3 revise that policy too, as it's shown on page 22.

4 Keep in mind that we do have approved certain
5 signs where it says School Days, but that is not a
6 prohibition, it's a permission. And that is, we have the
7 sign approved for R-25-ECA, and R-025-DCA, where for the
8 passenger loading only, it says school days, and for the
9 student loading, unloading, it says the hours and it
10 includes the school days.

11 So, what I would like the Committee to discuss
12 this submittal and approve it of course.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.

14 I think the earlier suggestion regarding the elimination of
15 the word "Department" is something that Caltrans staff will
16 have to let us know what they feel. And also reference to
17 removal of the local law enforcement concurrence for rural
18 areas, it goes back to their resources available and all
19 that. So, we'll see what those agencies have to say.

20 Who wants to go first? Chief?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I'd just like to
22 comment that on the standard that Mr. Babico is referring
23 to, it doesn't say that the law enforcement agency has to
24 approve the sign. It says that there has to be assurance
25 from the law enforcement agency responsible that they're

1 actually going to enforce the sign. So, to me that
2 indicates, in the original standard, the way it was written,
3 to try to limit just putting signs up everywhere if there's
4 never going to be any enforcement. It's a different issue
5 than approving the sign. It's discussing with the
6 enforcement agency whether they're going to enforce the no
7 parking where you are sign.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I think further
9 the two hour limitation that you have, you need to make sure
10 that you have some law enforcement patrol that patrols that
11 area, otherwise how do they enforce it? I think that was
12 the intent of the language. But, Johnny is there also, he
13 can refresh our memory.

14 Mr. Henley, do you have any thoughts on this?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well, you know, I was
16 thinking why would the Department be in there?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I can tell you.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I think I know, it's
19 because, you know, there are some of these situations on
20 state highways, but that's about the only --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, I think the
22 reason Department is there, is because we're dealing with
23 signs. If you read the heading, the heading is amended
24 Section Parking Standing and Stopping Signs, and the Vehicle
25 Code says nothing can be put up unless it's been approved by

1 Department. And then nothing can be approved by Department
2 unless consulted with cities and counties. So, the reason
3 Department is there, is to make sure they approve the sign.

4 In other words, the sign is a legal sign. So, that's what
5 it is.

6 And the law enforcement, I think frankly it was
7 put in for our protection, but Jacob raises a good point,
8 because in unincorporated areas CHP does parking, well, does
9 law enforcement or traffic enforcement. The problem is CHP
10 also has a policy that says they don't do local ordinances,
11 just manpower or what have you. So, that puts us in a crazy
12 regulation where we have to go to CHP. But, it doesn't mean
13 CHP, it could mean that we go to Sheriff's Department, if
14 they're doing the parking enforcement.

15 So, it's a confusion but, I see a way out of the
16 second part. The first part doesn't -- but, I have to say
17 Jacob's proposed language, I think clarifies it.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Chief?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: And just to clarify,
20 there is no policy that says we don't do local code
21 enforcement.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Parking, I meant.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: There's no policy that
24 says we don't do that. The policy, you know, and the
25 philosophy of the department is we have to prioritize

1 everything and it's public safety and traffic safety is
2 going to come first and then as resources are available, we
3 always respond to citizen's complaints for parking or any
4 other violations but, everything is in fact prioritized.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I work very
6 closely with CHP people in San Diego County, they actually
7 do parking enforcement in unincorporated areas. It's not
8 the priority, as the Chief said but, they do that if
9 available resources.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Refresh me if I'm wrong
11 but, I could have sworn at our last conversation about these
12 signs, there was a discussion about whether every format for
13 every possible legal no parking or stopping sign has to be
14 adopted in the MUTCD or whether you could mix and match
15 symbols and phrases on the signs that are listed as examples
16 within the MUTCD for your particular application, because
17 there are so many different possible combinations. And I
18 hope I'm right about that because since that discussion we
19 had a school zone issue come up and I ended up with some
20 really tall signs to get the lettering the right size but,
21 I've kind of already done this out on the street based on
22 that discussion, that using standard phrases created our own
23 custom school no parking signs.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Where the hours
25 can vary depending what school post them --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes, right.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes, some schools
3 may be like 7:30, 8:30, some schools may be 7:00 to 9:00,
4 whatever.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Jeff raises a very
6 good point. Can we hear from Johnny on that, the mix and
7 match, when you're finished Jeff?

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let's finish, let
9 me see if anybody --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: He's standing there at
11 the ready.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yeah, on that mix
13 and match.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let's keep him
15 waiting, you know, he can wait.

16 Anybody has any other thoughts or questions before
17 we ask Mr. Bhullar to come to the podium?

18 (No response.)

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No. Johnny.

20 MR. BHULLAR: I'm Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.

21 First I would like to address the question that Jacob
22 had regarding the word "Department". Basically throughout
23 the California MUTCD, whenever we use the word "Department",
24 and we do define it also, that means Caltrans, the State
25 Agency, so probably the way it was written, and I'm just

1 guessing here, is that in the traffic memo we had addressed
2 most of these items as if it was like all these devices were
3 going to go on the state highway system. So, I think maybe
4 we can make some corrections but, still, if it's on the
5 state highway system the intent here is that the agency
6 needs to at least get the department's approval for whenever
7 there are parking restrictions on the state highway system
8 that are going to be placed. And so with that, I think the
9 language can be edited a little bit here. But, that's the
10 explanation for the word "Department", because that's pretty
11 much how it was written in the traffic memo, and that's been
12 carried over.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, that's only
14 if the sign is installed on the state property?

15 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. So, we just need to clarify
16 the language a little bit. But, I do not agree at least
17 with the way Jacob recommended, just taking out the word
18 "Department", because that still needs to be carried on if
19 it's a state highway.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, you suggest
21 the language that says when the signs are installed on the
22 state facility the department shall approve installation?

23 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah, something like that. I cannot
24 come up with the text right now.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I think that's a

1 given anyway, cities and counties cannot go and post signs
2 on the state facility anyway.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But, there is a section
4 in the California Vehicle Code regarding the installation of
5 the no parking on state highways. It's very clearly that
6 you can go ahead and do it.

7 MR. BHULLAR: Is there? I'm not aware of that.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah, oh yeah. Before
9 -- before it was --

10 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah, but still --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: -- that the local
12 agencies, by ordinance or resolution, you will install the
13 no parking on state facilities.

14 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Then they
16 (indiscernible) and add another authority for the State
17 Department to install those.

18 MR. BHULLAR: For the State Department to install
19 it on the state highway?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: It doesn't need to go to
21 the local agency for approval.

22 MR. BHULLAR: No, I'm talking about the other way
23 around, where it's the local agency that's going to pass an
24 ordinance if they want to have a parking restriction on a
25 state highway.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, no, we can't,
2 because that is not our jurisdiction. Local agencies do not
3 have jurisdiction on a state facility.

4 MR. BHULLAR: So, that's unclear for the text here
5 probably, because I think the intent of the existing text,
6 or even the corrected text that is being proposed here, both
7 of those do not, I think, clarify the situation as we're
8 discussing.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I don't see any
10 harm in clarifying but, nobody can go on state property and
11 install any sign, period, so.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, no, my intention was
13 not on taking the Department, but you are saying to
14 initiate, okay, by local authorities and approval by the
15 department. If I want to put no parking signs on our
16 streets, why do I need department's approval?

17 MR. BHULLAR: You don't.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: That's my
19 interpretation.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: It's been my experience
22 that if there's a state highway, surface street state
23 highway, that Caltrans really doesn't want to be in the
24 business of regulating where the loading zones are and where
25 the time limit parking is and such. And so they say local

1 jurisdictions, you take care of it but you get our approval
2 first, because it is our facility. I think that was the
3 intent here, and I think if we just add the words, as Johnny
4 suggested, "on state highways" you must obtain approval from
5 the department, then I think that takes care of it.

6 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah, because there are situations
7 where Caltrans has run into some like maintenance agreements
8 with local agencies, so Caltrans sometimes is not even
9 actually maintaining the roadway like in the middle or the
10 center of a town. So, in those cases also it's pretty much
11 the maintenance agreement dictates the cities are
12 maintaining it so they're putting up the signs and taking
13 them down. So, that's where I think this comes into play.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, we
16 have a couple comments. Mr. Mansourian?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yeah, okay.

18 MR. BHULLAR: Then the main question that you are
19 asking about the mix and match, actually we have a couple of
20 places in the California MUTCD city, we have put in some
21 wordings which have been at least going through Caltrans
22 legal, we have been told, is that in California first of all
23 when you look at the Feds, the Feds allow you to do any word
24 messages on the signs. In California, we were told that
25 only the signs that are included in the California MUTCD

1 city, are the signs that are official, they are the ones
2 that are the official signs. So, you cannot create your own
3 word message signs. So, even Caltrans or local agencies
4 themselves cannot create their own word message signs. So,
5 the signs have to be brought into the Committee, if it's a
6 word message sign the Feds do not really care, they have
7 already given us the flexibility but, we still need to run
8 those signs through this Committee and make them official
9 and go into the book, only then they become official. So,
10 for the example that Jeff was citing, probably they will not
11 be an official sign.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, if we approve
13 something that says parking restriction 7:00 to 8:00 and
14 they want to change 7:30 to 8:30, they have to run it again?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: That's fine.

16 MR. BHULLAR: No, the way the wording we have put
17 in the California MUTCD cities, if it's a timing, if it's a
18 date, if it's a place name, and we have given those caveats,
19 except for that, other things --

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's fine. And
21 I think that's what Mr. Knowles' question was, that those
22 are allowed, depending on the local need.

23 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

25 MR. BHULLAR: Placement, distance, time and date.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But my followup
2 concern, and we can get down to the minutia of details, is
3 the recommendation is with regards really to adding the
4 phrase, "During School Days" to the sign. Now, in the
5 example it also says September to June. My schools go
6 August to June, so, you know, how much flexibility do we
7 have?

8 MR. BHULLAR: All right, let's keep that issue --

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That like say the
10 street sweeping this day or that day.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right, or what if I
12 don't put the months up there, and the standard sign has the
13 months, my signs don't have the months on them.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Go ahead.

15 MR. BHULLAR: Let's keep that issue separate. I
16 was just discussing and answering just to the word message
17 and the flexibility of creating a sign or not. Now,
18 dissecting into the school days, here what I would like to
19 point out is that there have been certain like lawsuits and
20 cases where the Judges have pointed out, and that is the
21 reason why we are so different in California, in that any
22 school limits or school zones are applicable whenever there
23 are children present. So, to me, honestly, until we run it
24 by our legal, I would not even be in favor of putting in
25 school days, September through June, because in California

1 the school zones are active whenever there are children
2 present, regardless of whether it's a weekday, weekend,
3 school on or off, regardless, 365 days around the clock.
4 That's how the codes are interpreted. And for satisfying
5 that requirement on purpose, we try to stay away from what
6 the Feds allow on school signs, especially like the school
7 speed limits. If they have the timing, the days, and we
8 have to take those out, and going as per the legal, there
9 was a legal case where it was pointed out and dissected in
10 detail, so Caltrans legal told us at that time, and I think
11 we have a written opinion on that, was that we can only use
12 the terms "When Children Are Present" to address that
13 sufficiently.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's exactly
15 the point I brought up last time and I think I was kidding
16 at that time, I said I hope somebody actually puts up a sign
17 that says no such and such school days and I get a ticket,
18 because that's going to be an easy ticket to actually fight
19 it all the way through, because how am I supposed to know
20 what a school day is? I don't live in the state, I don't
21 live in that community, you have to be very specific.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I was going to say,
23 these signs are limited to 500 feet from a school, I
24 presume, you know, they can be actually probably even on the
25 streets that aren't directly across the street from the

1 school, so, I don't think that -- I think it's a separate
2 issue than the speed limit.

3 MR. BHULLAR: But wouldn't there be also
4 applicable to within 2800 feet of the schools, because of
5 the CB --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No, I'm not sure.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Anyway, so there
8 is a request to add these signs, and there is a request to
9 amend the California MUTCD with this language as the County
10 of San Bernardino has suggested. So, Mr. Fisher?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: More questions for
12 Johnny. School days, I agree, is a little bit unclear but,
13 if they were to say September to June, would that require
14 that we approve a new sign or since we have days of the week
15 on signs, hours of the day, do we need the approval of this
16 Committee to then add months of the year on a sign?

17 MR. BHULLAR: No. As we had worked through this
18 subcommittee for the parking signs, the word "Schools" is
19 the one that is of course new, and that throws a different,
20 I would say, angle to the designs. But, if we are only
21 talking about the days, the hours or the months, those would
22 be okay because that's what we allow as the option to
23 deviate, meaning on the place, distance, date, time and so
24 the September through June does fall under the calendar or
25 the timing.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay. Then the second
2 part of my question then is, if we were to just have school
3 days and school days is evidence by if children are present.

4 If they're present, then it's obviously a school day. If
5 they aren't present, then it must be a holiday for them.
6 What is the problem there, if we just said school days?

7 MR. BHULLAR: Well, again, I don't see a problem.

8 All I can say is that in the past we have, on purpose,
9 stayed away from defining whether it's a date or a time when
10 it comes to schools. Schools being a very sensitive for a
11 couple of "litigations", it has been determined that
12 whenever you are within the school zones, and there are
13 children present, regardless whether it's day, night,
14 Monday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, whichever day, it becomes
15 applicable. But, I'm not legal, so I don't have any --

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I think -- let's
17 go to the Chief.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: But those arguments
19 have to do with safety issues, it's the speed, whether a
20 speed limit is enforceable in a school zone, where it
21 becomes a school zone because the children are present.
22 This is not a safety issue, this is a neighborhood issue
23 trying to keep people from parking there. So, I don't think
24 that the same argument can be used for a no parking sign
25 that they're using, that you're using for enforcing a speed

1 limit in a school zone.

2 MR. BHULLAR: Honestly, you could be right. I
3 don't know.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Knowles?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I just want to -- again
6 -- so you're saying times, dates, so we don't have to worry
7 about, you know, a special sign that includes the phrase,
8 you know, "Except Weekends and Holidays", because that's a
9 time and date issue. What about, again, I didn't think this
10 was a much of an issue before but, then we need arrows too
11 and we have to specify a right sign versus the left sign. I
12 mean because I was more happy with the mix and match concept
13 than every sign has to be formalized in this way.

14 MR. BHULLAR: Well, the way we have interpreted
15 that, at least our legal has interpreted for us, is that any
16 sign in California, either it's in the California MUTCD, the
17 only flexibility you have is of course would be destination,
18 the distance, the place name, the date, the time, and that's
19 what we define. Apart from that, yes, you have to have it
20 in the book.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

22 Mr. Fisher, and then we go to --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: It seems to me that the
24 signs presented here have simply -- the signs have taken
25 signs that have already been approved, and all they've added

1 is months or the word "School Days" to define more precisely
2 when they're in effect. I would argue that since they are
3 only adding months of the year, and we already have other
4 signs that say school days, and school days are evident by
5 children being present, that our current guidelines already
6 allow a reasonable mix and match, and therefore would allow
7 these signs, without having to get express approval of the
8 school --

9 MR. BHULLAR: I --

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Knowles, --
11 let --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah, well we do have
13 some signs in the MUTCD, and that's why I grabbed the
14 phrase, that say "School Days" on them. I think there's a
15 symbolic loading sign that says School --

16 MR. BHULLAR: They are here?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes. That says "School
18 Days", so it was already an approved phrase. And my concern
19 is, if you just say September through June, then you're
20 going to have to add two more lines at the standardized text
21 that say except weekends and holidays, if you're not allowed
22 to say school days. I mean we're trying to make the signs
23 as brief as possible but, these get very tall when you need
24 to standardize the font sizes.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Mr. Chairman?

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: My previous proposal was
3 not with the months, it was hours and school days. But,
4 because of the argument raised where somebody doesn't know
5 whether the school is opened or not, and it was requested to
6 me to come out with another idea, I don't mind taking out
7 the months, okay. But, keep it at school days. And the
8 purpose of that is, if you don't put the school days, the
9 meaning that you are prohibiting parking during weekends.
10 We would like to take advantage of that, having the
11 residents to park during weekends. Why to prohibit them?

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, if there's a
13 school function, say on Saturday, and the kids are there,
14 does that count as a school day or not?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Usually it's weekends.
16 I mean let's not get into these --

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. I just
18 hope you don't get a ticket.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: -- these intricate --

20 MR. BHULLAR: Jacob, we could have made it so much
21 easier when we were working on the parking sign subcommittee
22 and we created those school day, loading, unloading signs,
23 we could have included these.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I didn't have that case
25 at that time.

1 (Laughter.)

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. We need to
3 move on on this item, so --

4 MR. BHULLAR: I think it's certainly within the
5 rules if the Committee does recommend, because I do see the
6 word "School Days" as September through June being just like
7 timing and the date issues, rather than trying to be silent,
8 we can even include a version of these into the official
9 signs, and that would make it easy for everyone and put
10 everything to rest.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Let's do
12 it one at a time so that we get something done.

13 First, let's look at the language on page 22, the
14 proposal, the strike throughs and the red text. Let's focus
15 on that and then we'll go to signs.

16 Mr. Mansourian?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: My recommendation is
18 on option where it's black, that it's striking out. If we
19 clarify that limited parking restrictions may be initiated
20 by local authorities on local streets, as an example, and
21 approved by department on state highways, takes care of the
22 issue that I hear Johnny has, that I hear Jacob has.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Because that's
25 clarifies who is doing what to whom.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. And then
2 about the law enforcement?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The law enforcement,
4 I'm okay as is, because --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: By as is, you
6 mean the black text?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The black, and the
8 reason is we typically know CHP doesn't have the manpower,
9 and if we're doing limited parking in rural areas, we ask
10 the Sheriff can you do it, and you know, but I can see
11 Jacob's concern, because at times law enforcement says no,
12 but we're told by the City Council and Board of Supervisors
13 they don't care. So --

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And you don't --
15 the text doesn't say that you need their concurrence, it
16 says assurance.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: It says assurance.
18 That assurance means they're going to do it, you know, in
19 consultation with --

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You can change it
21 to in consultation with, I don't know, how do you think it?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Well, the way I see
23 this is, again, it seems to me the verbiage is to stop signs
24 from being just posted everywhere, where there's no chance
25 of enforcement. So, I mean from the enforcement side, I

1 really don't care where you put your signs. I think this
2 was put in there for your benefit, not ours.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Our protection, no,
4 I agree, that's why I'm telling Jacob that, I don't know his
5 situation. I'm fine with black or red on that part.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You're running
7 for office now, huh. Okay.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Correct. Don't know
9 which one yet but --

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So the option for
11 one, I think that's a good suggestion. If after the local
12 authorities, if the language is added, that if there's a
13 state highway involved, we're not going to word smith it
14 here, if there's a state highway involved, the department
15 must approve the parking restriction.

16 On the standard, we heard from two people,
17 Mr. Fisher, Mr. Henley, any thoughts on that, or Jeff,
18 Mr. Knowles?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: I think the revised
20 standard needs some work, it doesn't read right. It mixes
21 singular subject with a pleural verb, and a pleural subject
22 with a singular verb. I think we could determine, unless
23 Caltrans strongly disagrees, that the mixing and matching
24 already allows --

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, no, I'm

1 talking on the text, stay on the text.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Oh. I would just like
3 to keep the black and on state highways, as we discussed
4 earlier, for option one.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Any other
6 thoughts on that? Mr. Babico, is that acceptable to you?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, I like it as is but,
8 I have no objection if they revise it.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, no, no, if
10 the standard, in terms of assurance from CHP stays as is?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: We did not go through
12 that process.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: As far as I know.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, you
16 post the signs and then --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: We install the signs and
18 we go.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Let's
20 separate these two issues, if possible, let's vote on one at
21 a time, because I think the sign is going to get maybe a
22 little bit more complicated.

23 So, I have a proposal, it's not even a motion, I
24 have a proposal to add the language to options saying that
25 if it's a state facility involved, the department must

1 approve. But, on the standard, there is a suggestion to
2 either re-work the red text significantly, or stay with the
3 black. Where do you want to go? Anybody ready to make a
4 motion on the changes to the text? Because the text is
5 separate from the sign.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I'll move on option
7 that the new text say, "limited time parking restriction may
8 be initiated by local authorities on local streets, and
9 approved by department if on state highways."

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: "Parking
12 prohibitions between certain hours may also be initiated by
13 local authorities on local streets." I'm not adding
14 anything more than just clarifying jurisdiction.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So, that's on
17 option. Do you want to vote on that before we go on the
18 standard?

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, we go to
20 three votes. No, this is a revision to the text, let's deal
21 with one more.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Okay. On --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Farhad, I think we're
24 complicating it.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Okay.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: I think the intent was
2 just to say if it's a state highway, you need Caltrans
3 approval. And what we've done is we say, on a local street,
4 local jurisdictions have the right to install signs. And
5 then if it's a state highway, I don't think we need the
6 first part but, if you feel we do --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Well, because it
8 says we do.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Oh.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Go ahead.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: If you have a better
12 way, I'll be more than happy to --

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Probably the
14 better way is just to keep what Mr. Babico has suggested.
15 At the end of the paragraph add the language that if these
16 restrictions are to be implemented on the state facility,
17 the department approval is required. Something like that.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Is required. I'm
19 fine either way.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Which is stating
21 the obvious but, if you want to do it --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: The whole context of
23 that, of those two sentences is if it is on a state highway.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I don't see why
25 we need to say that -- I mean it's just, the City of Los

1 Angeles cannot put parking restriction on a county facility
2 or a neighboring city, you cannot do that on state highway
3 either, it's a given, it's the way that the government
4 operates. I don't know why we need to introduce it into
5 MUTCD. I mean if it's a state facility, the city or the
6 county cannot go and post signs without state approval.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Right, but it needs to
8 say that, and it doesn't say that.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Why? You don't
10 say that, you have to do it if it's the County of Los
11 Angeles. If it's not your jurisdiction, if it's not your
12 property, you cannot post any signs period. That's what I'm
13 saying. So, that's why --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: But you can with
15 Caltrans approval.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah, but that is not
19 shown in the California Vehicle Code. Probably that what
20 you said is in the local street and highways code. Every
21 jurisdiction can do their work within their boundaries.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, but if it's
23 a state facility, it's not your boundary, it's not your
24 jurisdiction.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah, but it's not in

1 the Vehicle Code is what I'm trying to say.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Well, anyway, if
3 you want to clarify it, I have no problem adding language at
4 the end saying if it's a state facility you need to get
5 Caltrans approval. But, don't complicate it.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: But when we say
7 initiated, initiated means we start it and someone finishes
8 it.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: That's my interpretation
10 of it.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: And that's why I think
12 the context is, if it's on a state highway and the city
13 initiates it, or the county initiates it, and the state
14 gives approval. So, I think if we want to say that the
15 local jurisdictions can put restrictions on their local
16 streets, we need to say that they approve it rather than
17 they initiate it.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, okay.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So, if we want to do it
20 that way, I would say approved.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, do you have a
22 suggested language?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yes. "Limited time
24 parking restrictions may be approved by local agencies on
25 local streets." If the --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, can you say "and
2 by Statement Department on state facilities for roadways."

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, I had been going
4 with Farhad's theme.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I was trying to be
6 simple.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Right. And I think the
8 simplest thing is to just say on state highways, limited
9 time parking may be initiated by local agencies and approved
10 by the department.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Say it again?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: "On state highways,
13 limited time parking restrictions may be initiated by local
14 authorities and approved by the department."

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Is that the
16 extension of the red paragraph under "Option"?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yeah.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. We're
19 going to spend like five more minutes. If we cannot come to
20 agreement, we're not ready, then you may need to take it
21 back and work the language, because otherwise we are going
22 to be trying to wordsmith this for the next hour.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Would it be appropriate
24 to ask Caltrans to maybe come up with some language on the
25 option, because I think Caltrans put it in there for their

1 reasons and maybe they would be the best ones to wordsmith
2 it.

3 MR. BHULLAR: I think simply on the black option
4 there, if we start out with on state highways, because I
5 think the intent here is that on the state highways, cities
6 or local agencies can at least initiate, and then of course
7 the state does it, so if you started with on state highways,
8 and then the rest of it is the black option language the way
9 it is. That can take care of it.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Is that
12 acceptable?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Could you
15 say that again.

16 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. The option will be "On state
17 highways limited time parking restrictions may be initiated
18 by local authorities and approved by the department."

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There you go,
20 that's going to take care of it, because the jurisdiction,
21 they can do whatever they want with their own streets.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So, this is my new
23 substitute motion.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. This is a
25 new substitute motion. Now let's go to the standard.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Do you want to get a
2 second?

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, let us do the
4 whole thing.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: On standard, I think
6 the easiest way, if it's creating problems for San
7 Bernardino County, instead of "assurance shall be obtained",
8 we can just say "in consultation with the law enforcement
9 agency", that's it.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Make a
11 motion now.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: "Before time limit
13 parking regulations are approved in rural area" --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Areas.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Right, that's where
16 I am under "Standard", "consultation shall be made with law
17 enforcement agency on enforcement."

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, your
19 motion is two parts, we heard both parts. Is there a second
20 to the motion?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'll second it.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. There's a
23 motion --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Can I have --

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Wait, wait, let

1 me --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Oh, sorry, go ahead.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So there's a
4 motion and second, now discuss it.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. A friendly
6 modification, instead of "shall" make it "should".

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: "Should."

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: So then it's guidance,
9 it's not standard now.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The problem is this
11 is standard.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, make it guidance,
13 don't make it standard.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, all it's saying is
15 that you shall talk, it doesn't require that you agree at
16 the end of the day, it just says you initiate that
17 discussion.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Let me ask you a
19 question.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Shouldn't that be done
21 in rural areas?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, but John, within
23 the city, don't have rural roads?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: A few.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: If you have, would this

1 standard apply to yours, then you have to consult with the
2 city PD.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, fortunately we
4 enforce it within our own departments.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: That's what I'm saying.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So, we consult with each
7 other.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: They have their
9 own parking division, they have their own parking manager in
10 the region.

11 Okay. That's actually a critical issue because if
12 you keep it as "shall" and they don't, then that parking
13 sign is not enforceable, they can challenge it in the court.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Well, I think it
15 doesn't do anybody any good to have signs that are posted,
16 that nobody knows are posted, or they're not going to be
17 enforced. And if we change the language, there has to be at
18 least some discussion, I think that's appropriate. It's not
19 the city traffic department that's going to get the calls
20 from the citizens because the parking is not being enforced,
21 it's going to be the law enforcement agency responsible for
22 enforcing those signs. And so if the law enforcement agency
23 doesn't even know they're up there, has no idea, and then
24 all of a sudden is getting this onslaught of calls, you're
25 just shifting the problem on to us. And if you're going to

1 do that, there needs to be a discussion on the front end.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, the
3 motion, there's a motion under discussion, and the motion is
4 to keep it as a standard and have it "shall" instead of
5 "assurance" say "shall consult" the law enforcement, rather
6 than "assurance" or "concurrence". So, there at least needs
7 to be a phone call. There's a motion and a second, we have
8 had enough discussion, I think, all those in favor say aye.

9 (Ayes.)

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Oh, Mr. Fisher,
11 you have some more?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: I'm sorry, and I hate to
13 drag this out but, the end of the sentence is that the
14 regulation will be actively enforced. So, do we want to say
15 consultation shall be made, that the regulation will be
16 actively enforced?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, that wasn't the
18 motion, because that puts them in a veto --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So, we're striking that
20 language.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yeah.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yeah, just to
24 consultation.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Just to

1 consultation.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay. It ends at
3 "enforcement agency" then?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Right.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay. I'm onboard.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Now we
7 have it clear. Are you clear, Mr. Singh, on this?

8 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So, delete that
9 (indiscernible) after enforcement agency.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Can you read it again
12 please, your revised motion?

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Mansourian,
14 will you read?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: "Option" --

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, no, the
17 standard.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: We're done on the
19 Option?

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, the standard.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I was just hoping to
22 get us more in the mood of agreeing. Under "Standard",
23 "Before time limit parking regulations are approved, local
24 law enforcement shall be consulted with." That's it.

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So, you're deleting

1 individual --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Oh, should be, I'm
3 sorry -- no -- shall be, shall is mandatory.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Don't even put
5 local, law enforcement, because the jurisdictions have
6 different way of handling than counties do, CHP, which is
7 not local law enforcement.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, we also do
9 Sheriff, that's why I'm saying local.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So just leave it
11 law enforcement.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Law enforcement,
13 sure.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: One question on
15 clarification, did you intend to remove "rural areas"?
16 Because I had no issues as long as it's --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, I'm sorry, in
18 rural areas.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Thank you. "Before
21 time limit parking are approved in rural areas, law
22 enforcement agencies shall be consulted."

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. There is a
24 motion very clear, there is a second, we have had
25 discussion. Do you want to vote or do you want to discuss

1 more? Okay, let's vote.

2 All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

3 (Ayes.)

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Opposition?

5 (No response.)

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: The motion passes
7 unanimously.

8 Okay. So, we have the text finalized. Let's look
9 at the signs.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: On the sign, can I
11 jump in?

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: John Fisher was
14 raising a point, and I think that should be very quickly
15 decided. The word "No Stopping" we already have a sign,
16 correct?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: And we heard from
19 John Bhullar saying the time, date is all approved. So, the
20 7:00 to 8:00 a.m., as an example, right, and the September
21 to June as an example, appears to be okay. Did I hear it
22 correct?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Date and time,
24 you are flexible.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, we don't have month,

1 no month.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I'm sorry?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No month.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yeah, but the time
5 and the --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Only times.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Correct. So, my --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: And the days.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: -- my question is
10 this, is there a sign approved that uses the words "School
11 Days"? The answer is yes.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But it's not prohibition
13 as this.

14 MR. BHULLAR: Recently, yeah, recently we created
15 new signs which do address school days for loading,
16 unloading and situations.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Okay. So,
18 following, Johnny, what you were telling us about the place,
19 distance, date and time, then why can't we mix and match and
20 have this sign without our approval?

21 MR. BHULLAR: Except that in the exceptions that
22 we have noted, we did not say like school days. We did say
23 the date, time, place and all the others, so if the intent
24 is here, I think it would be better if we just create an
25 extra sign and put it into the California MUTCD.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So, if we get rid of
2 the word "School Days" --

3 MR. BHULLAR: Then it's fine, we can mix and match
4 -- yes --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: -- the sign is fine.

6 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Or, you're saying if
8 you do want to put "School Days", bring a sign back that
9 says "School Days"?

10 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Okay, thank you.
12 Now I get it.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I think it's much
14 easier because we already say "Except Weekends", instead of
15 the "School Days" it can say "Except Weekends" and solve the
16 problem.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, but holidays.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, I'm --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I can see the problem
20 during Christmas Holidays, you know, the family comes home,
21 you want them to park in front of the house and they can't.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: What about those
23 days that teachers go to school and kids don't go. So, I'm
24 just waiting to get one of these tickets and fight back
25 through the court. Go ahead.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I mean the easiest way,
2 and cleanest, is to put the hours and school days. What's
3 wrong with that?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I think it appears,
5 from what we've just heard from Johnny, a new sign, because
6 we have everything else, that would allow us to use the
7 words "School Days", is what we should consider, that
8 clarifies and clears everything.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah, but that is black
10 and white, not red, like we have.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: He's saying with the red
12 sign, red school days.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, we don't have on
14 red school.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: He's saying allow it,
16 red school.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Oh, allow it, okay. All
18 right. But, we don't have an existing sign.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, I'm talking
20 about new proposal. If we would approve the use of the
21 words "School Days", with the flexibility we have, then we
22 can mix and match the date and the times and the hours.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Right.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I think that's the
25 best way to proceed.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Is that your
2 motion, do you want to make a motion on this?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yes. I just did.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, what's your
5 motion?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Johnny, is the right
7 way to say --

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Before,
9 Mr. Mansourian --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: -- is that we allow
11 the word "School Days" --

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Before you go,
13 let Johnny.

14 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah, just actually I would like to
15 point out here is, if you make this motion today, this is a
16 very small little window here today, in which we are working
17 with to get our California MUTCD Region finalized by
18 tomorrow. So, if you do make the motion today, I can
19 probably even get this signed in by tomorrow's official
20 memo, I can put it there. It's a very narrow window that we
21 have today.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So, Johnny --

23 MR. BHULLAR: Because I'm still working with
24 (indiscernible) and we have been going back and forth on a
25 number of issues, so I have not been cleared, as of this

1 morning, to go ahead with the revision, so the window is
2 still opened.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, this is the
4 last car in the lobby, this is the sticker price, you don't
5 want to take it --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Okay. So, is the
7 right motion would be just to authorize the use of the words
8 "School Days", is that what I should say?

9 MR. BHULLAR: Well, we can pick, since we have the
10 school sketches right here, if the CTCDC recommends which of
11 these or which one or two of these that you want, once we
12 put in one example then of course it can be carried on to
13 the other signs. And we can just create -- we will take
14 care of the creating of the sign and putting into the book.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So my --

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Mr. Chairman --

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let Mr. Henley --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'd like to just make a
20 motion to adopt these signs as Mr. Babico has proposed, and
21 let it go at that.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. There's a
23 motion. Is there a second for that?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Jacob, your
25 seconding his suggestion for your signs?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Say it again?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: He made the
3 motion to approve your signs, do you want to second it?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yes.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Just checking, I
7 just want to make sure we're all on the same page.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: The motion and a
9 second. Mr. Fisher?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: If you would consider
11 this a friendly amendment, I want to be supportive of
12 allowing the word "School Days" to be shown on a sign. I
13 think all we need to do is illustrate one sign that says,
14 "No stopping 7:00 to 8:00, 2:00 to 3:00 School Days", that
15 is consistent in format with the R-28 and R-30 signs, and
16 therefore illustrates the concept rather than having the
17 four different combinations.

18 MR. BHULLAR: In fact, if we do the first one
19 there with the arrow, then of course the second one is
20 covered and the first by not doing the arrows.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Right.

22 MR. BHULLAR: And so the first one can pretty much
23 be a catch-all.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: That would just
25 illustrate School Days without the September through June.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. I accept the
2 friendly amendment.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Good.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I accept, I second the
6 friendly amendment.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, what
8 is exactly the motion to approve what?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: The first to the left.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: The first sign.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Minus September to June.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Minus September -
13 - no, no, September to June stays.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, exactly as is.
15 Exactly as is.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah. So, the
17 motion and the second are to approve the sign to the left.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Hamid, he has a
19 question.

20 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, it's very hard to
21 figure out who is speaking. If you could try to speak one
22 at a time, it will make the transcript a lot clearer.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Good. Thank you
24 for reminding us, we appreciate it.

25 So, is the motion, now that we're clear, the

1 motion is on page 23, is to approve the sign that is to the
2 left and eliminate the other three signs, and approve the
3 sign to the left exactly as is proposed. So, that's the
4 motion, we have had discussion. Do you want to vote or do
5 you want to discuss more?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Vote.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: All those in
8 favor?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I'm sorry, public
10 comment?

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, we had public
12 comment -- did we have public comment on this?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I don't remember.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Sorry, my
15 apologies, Mr. Lipinski, come to the podium.

16 MR. LIPINSKI: Conrad Lipinski, City of Dana
17 Point. I have exactly this situation going and I support
18 the friendly amendment with the word "School Days", the
19 arrows I can stick on now, the months I can stick on now, I
20 just need the "School Days" and I can mix and match. If you
21 put that other example in, then anybody who looks at it
22 could say well, I didn't know it was this month, I didn't
23 know where the arrows went. I can already do those on
24 supplementals. So, I just need "School Days".

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Very good. Glad

1 to have the wisdom of Mr. Lipinski, one of my mentors.

2 Any other members of the public who wishes to
3 speak on this item?

4 (No response.)

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Seeing none,
6 okay, motion, second, let's vote.

7 Mr. Babico?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. Can I make a
9 motion to accept the first one to the left without the
10 months.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There is already
12 a motion and a second. I can't entertain another motion
13 until we vote on this motion.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. Go ahead.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The reason, I'm
16 sorry, just so we're clear, the reason Johnny was suggesting
17 pick one, like the one on the left, was for illustrative
18 purposes. We already, as Mr. Lipinski said, can do
19 everything. We're really adding "School Days". He was
20 trying for us to have an illustrative. So, we are really
21 voting for the one on the left, which is really for School
22 Days, everything else we already do.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: We don't have the months
24 already approved. We don't have such a sign with months.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Johnny says we can.

1 MR. BHULLAR: The months are allowed because we do
2 allow you to put in the date, meaning whether it's the hour,
3 whether it's a week or a day or the month.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: And you can live without
5 it.

6 MR. BHULLAR: That is correct, yeah, that is even
7 currently allowed on any sign.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Just to clarify, I
10 introduced my friendly amendment with the understanding that
11 we already had the authority to show a single arrow or a
12 double arrow, or no arrow, and we already had the authority
13 to put in months of the year, and so the only question here
14 was School Days. And so that if we had a sign that just
15 added the word "School Days", then that would clarify that
16 that is an acceptable part of the mix and match that we get.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Very good.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So, that was my friendly
19 amendment that I thought was seconded.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: And that was my
21 interpretation of your amendment.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay, all right.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Thank you.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. We have
25 had a motion, we have had friendly amendment and a friendly

1 interpretation, and we have had a lot of discussion.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Friendly discussion.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Well, we have had
4 some friendly discussions, not all. Let's vote on this.
5 Everyone is clear on what the motion is.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yes.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let's go, all
8 those in favor say aye.

9 (Ayes.)

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Opposition? I'm
11 voting no on this because of the School Days issue but, the
12 motion passes seven to one.

13 Okay. Let me ask one question. Is there anybody
14 in the room who is not here for Item 10-1, which is, in
15 short, the Bicycle Timing?

16 (No response.)

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, we are
18 going to break for like, let's make it seven minutes, we are
19 going to be back at 11:10 and we'll take the Item 10-1 at
20 that time. Thank you.

21 (Off the record at 11:03 a.m.)

22 (On the record at 11:10 a.m.)

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. We are
24 going to call the meeting to order. Where are the rest of
25 our members? Mr. Fisher? Calling Mr. Fisher.

1 Let's see, who else is missing? Okay. We are
2 going to call the meeting back to order. We have a pretty
3 busy agenda and we want to get people out of here at a
4 reasonable time so they can catch their flights and all.

5 Mr. Henley, during the break you told me that you
6 would like to change a little bit and which item do you want
7 to go first?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: 10-2.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: 10-2 or 10-4?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: 10-2.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. 10-2.

12 Okay. 10-2 is a Proposal to amend existing typical
13 applications and adopt new TA's for accommodating bicyclists
14 in TTC Zones and Revise California MUTCD Section 6D.101 and
15 6G.

16 Go ahead.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. What I'd like to
18 do, we have Jess Bhullar, is he around, is he here? Jesse?

19 I see Johnny, where is Jesse? Jesse. The Strategic
20 Highway Safety plan is an effort required by the latest
21 Transportation, Federal Transportation Bill, and it's an
22 ongoing process with about 300 people involved in the State
23 of California, and they've come up with a lot of action
24 items. And one of the action items is improving bicycle and
25 pedestrian mobility and safety through construction zones.

1 And so what I would do, to get this thing sort of put in its
2 element, is to have Johnny -- not Johnny but Jesse Bhullar,
3 to sort of give us an overview of the Strategic Highway
4 Safety Planning process, and maybe a little bit about this
5 particular action item.

6 MR. BHULLAR: First of all, I would like to thank
7 the Committee for giving us an opportunity to make a
8 presentation on behalf of the California Strategic Highway
9 Safety Plan Team.

10 And so in order to make or promotion
11 recommendations for bicycle safety in work zones, I will say
12 that yes, I do look older and wiser than my twin, who is six
13 minutes older than me, that you're regularly used to seeing.

14 So, yeah, I haven't come as much to the Committee but, for
15 specifically this item.

16 The pitch I'm trying to make to you is also on
17 behalf of our Director, Randy Vesaki. Our Department has
18 made a commitment, just like the other departments have made
19 a commitment to implement these actions by June of 2010.

20 So, going through the presentation, after the presentation,
21 I will ask for any comments and I can answer questions. I
22 did have some handouts, I had it enough for the Committee
23 members, but I have brought some extra that Johnny is
24 handing them out. And if you don't get all the handouts,
25 there is a facts sheet, so if you get the facts sheet below

1 there, there's a website on the back page, and you can get
2 these documents from there or you can contact me on the
3 website and we can get you the documents.

4 So, a little bit of the history of the Strategic
5 Highway Safety Plan. It's as part of the Safety New
6 Legislation signed by President in October of 2005, it's a
7 requirement. For the very first time, a requirement for all
8 states to develop its Strategic Highway Safety Plan. The
9 State Department of Transportation were to take the lead,
10 and Caltrans took the lead to initiate the process.

11 However, as soon as we started working on it, we soon very
12 realized that this is an all encompassing very, very
13 comprehensive highway safety approach that we have never
14 done that before. So, that includes all the 4-Es of
15 Engineering, Enforcement, Education and Emergency Medical
16 Services. So, we had about over 80 agencies part of this
17 state core group, over 300 members who came together and
18 this is the product at that point in time, the document.
19 So, very, very high level. Try to look at what the
20 challenges are facing California, and based upon the
21 challenges, looking at the data, they came up with 16 very
22 distinct challenge areas. So, those were the 16 challenge
23 areas that we felt that if we focus on those, we can really
24 make big improvements in getting the numbers down.

25 So, once we had that approved in 2006, it became

1 very clear, after the momentum we had, all the people we
2 had, that it's still very high level, it does not get down
3 to the detailed level of an actionable items in terms of who
4 does what, what is the very specific action. So, that is
5 when we reached out to over 500 stake holders through
6 various summits, and we had more people joining the team,
7 and at that time we delved into very specifically these 16
8 challenge areas. So, various members from Northern and
9 Southern California, from public and private agencies that
10 joined the groups, based upon their interest, knowledge,
11 experience, background, whatever was really their focus, so
12 they joined these different 16 challenge area teams.

13 So, these 16 challenge area teams, they came up
14 with a lot of actions and as they came up with actions, we
15 very quickly realized there's over 2000 actions that they
16 are recommending. And we all know what happens when you put
17 a plan together and it has 2000 actions, it's just going to
18 sit on somebody's shelf, nobody can do 2000 actions, you
19 don't have the resources. So, being mindful of the fact,
20 the Steering Committee decided that we are going to go
21 through these actions and try to first ask the groups to
22 prioritize and then we are going to limit them to very
23 specifically which are the things we can do now in terms of
24 the next, I would say two to six years. And based upon that
25 152 of these actions got approved. And I'm not going to go

1 into all the details of the 152, however, two of those
2 actions are the ones that we will be discussing today.

3 Once these actions got approved in the May of
4 2008, the Business Transportation Housing Agency, they were
5 very specific about monitoring and tracking. They wanted
6 the different State Departments to take the lead in leading
7 these actions. It doesn't mean they are the only ones
8 implementing or doing them, however, they were wanted to
9 assign roads on which actions are going to be implemented,
10 or who is taking the lead on that.

11 So, we have developed the monthly performance
12 tracking tool, that we are working on. We are also tracking
13 all of these actions.

14 But, before I get into a little more detail on
15 that, I did want to give you a little quick background on
16 the Executive Committee. So, as the agency was interested
17 in very specifically different departments taking the lead,
18 it was very clear this effort is by no means just led by
19 Caltrans. We have, I represent Caltrans as part of the
20 co-leader, we have four co-leaders, who are leading this.
21 The second member is Honorable Committee Member Chief
22 Maynard, Robert Maynard. He is representing the California
23 Highway Patrol, but mostly the enforcement side of it. I
24 represent the engineering side of it. And then we have
25 Chris Murphy, who is the Office of Traffic Safety Director.

1 He represents the education piece of it. But then one big
2 missing piece was the local agencies, and we have Pat
3 Mintern, who represents the California State Association of
4 Counties, he's a Public Works Director from Shasta County,
5 but he's representing the County. So, there's four
6 co-leaders who are leading this overall effort. And then we
7 have different challenge area leaders. However, the
8 Committee, the Steering Committee has a role but, there is a
9 higher level Executive Committee. The Executive Committee
10 is formed by the Directors, CEO, Commissioner, different
11 titles but from all these departments, so the CHP, DMV
12 Office of Traffic Safety, ABC is Alcohol and Beverage
13 Control, Department of Public Health, Emergency Medical
14 Services Authority. So, they form the Executive Committee
15 along with FHWA and (indiscernible) and the Federal Motor
16 Carrier, the Regional Administrators.

17 So, there was an MOU that was developed, a
18 Memorandum of Understanding, between all the Directors
19 agreeing to work together and have our departments work
20 together on these actions, and help each other in
21 implementing these actions.

22 Right now we have monthly Steering Committee
23 meetings, where all the status of the 152 actions is
24 discussed, the progress is noted. And we have a tool that
25 we track the performance on each one of the actions. There

1 is quarterly Transportation Directors meeting, these are the
2 five departments of Caltrans, the DMV, CHP, Office of
3 Traffic Safety and Alcohol and Beverage Control, those
4 directors, on a quarterly basis, get together and SHSP
5 status is a standing item there, where I go in and report on
6 what the status is and where we are in implementing these
7 actions.

8 There is also an annual Executive Leadership
9 meeting, that's like a half day meeting when all the
10 directors get together and the only thing we are talking
11 about is Strategic Highway Safety Plan. They get a status
12 but, more importantly, they provide us with a future
13 direction of what they want us to do for next year, which
14 areas they want to primarily focus on, they will emphasize
15 and they want us to expedite some of these actions.

16 So, that's the tracking and the leadership, the
17 buy-in, the commitment that the directors have made to the
18 agency secretary that we are going to be delivering these
19 actions by a certain time frame. So, I'll get to the
20 details in a little bit.

21 So, the BTH Agency has included the Strategic
22 Highway Safety Plan implementation plan in its California
23 Economic Development Work Plan, so this is part of that,
24 that's another reason why they are tracking these actions
25 and the implementation. And all the departments who are on

1 the Executive Committee, they have also included it within
2 their own department's strategic plan. So, I just wanted to
3 kind of emphasize the importance of the Strategic Highway
4 Safety Plan implementation.

5 And all the departments who are leading this,
6 there are very specific items that they have indicated that,
7 there are about 81, that will be done by June of 2010.
8 Again, remember, this was way back in May of 2008, when the
9 commitment was made. And I'll show you the progress very
10 soon.

11 So, they are receiving monthly updates on this.
12 The department directors are following progress very
13 closely. The June 2010 goal will be a great success for the
14 departments if all of them can meet that goal for all the
15 actions, and the departments have committee. And so far, as
16 far as I know, most of them are on track but two of the
17 actions are in front of this Committee and that's one of the
18 reasons also why I am here really trying to help promote, if
19 we can expedite and really --

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Jesse, I hate to
21 interrupt you. Can I make a suggestion, can you move to the
22 item a little bit faster, in the interest of time?

23 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It's very good,
25 it's very interesting information but just in the interest

1 of time if you move to the item.

2 MR. BHULLAR: Will do, okay. So, here's just
3 quickly all the actions. So, 81-48 are completed. I just
4 wanted to show you all the agencies are working progress.
5 Now, the items are challenge area 13, the 13.6 action item
6 is provide improved guidance and standards in the California
7 MUTCD for safely accommodating bicycle in work zones. So,
8 that is one specific action.

9 The challenge area 14, which is enhance work
10 (indiscernible), so these are two separate challenge areas,
11 in there the action is encourage present efforts to improve
12 access and the tours for bicyclist and pedestrian near work
13 zones.

14 So, both of these teams, as they were discussing
15 these actions, these items are almost very similar and they
16 have very, very similar recommendations for them, and in the
17 details. So, the team has been working very closely with
18 Johnny and other experts, and they have been trying to put
19 together how to really meet or implement these actions.

20 So, just the composition of the teams, different
21 teams, what they're doing, and Johnny and others, they will
22 get into a lot more detail on the various specifics of these
23 two actions, because we have had various discussion on what
24 the proposals are, what the diagrams are, what the details
25 are. But, I just wanted to kind of give you a little bit,

1 that this is a very, very comprehensive team.

2 Just at the end, I did want to show you that based
3 upon what we have been doing right now, we are very close to
4 reaching the target of reducing the fatalities. Those are
5 just numbers shown there. So, I'm going to end it here,
6 because what I wanted to do was really highlight the
7 importance of acting now, the due date of June 30, 2010, the
8 commitment directors have made and why we are trying to push
9 for. So, if the items can be moved forward quickly, we will
10 be able to meet some of these deadlines. And we have been
11 working very closely so Johnny and others are going to share
12 with you the details, so a lot of work has gone into it.
13 So, as we come up with those, please, if you have any
14 questions for me, I will stay behind to answer, and I would
15 like to turn it over to Johnny.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you. Thank
17 you, Jesse, I appreciate it.

18 Johnny, this is -- we are talking about 20 pages
19 of the standards changes and modifications. It's page 27 to
20 page 47, actually through 46. So, we are talking about 20
21 pages. So, we're not going to have time to go page by page,
22 so if you just present the essence of the recommendations
23 very briefly. And members, I hope that you're not planning
24 on reading them now here, that's the idea that you got the
25 standards before. And then let's focus on any comments

1 specific that you may have.

2 With that, if you focus just on the essence of
3 each.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Can I just say one
5 thing?

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Sure.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: You know, these changes
8 are essentially for typical applications. They were worked
9 on by, you know, with representatives from Design and CBAC,
10 and a variety of interests in Traffic Safety. And so this
11 is a product of quite a few people working for about six
12 months.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It's excellent
14 work. For the purpose of the people who are following it in
15 the audience, it's pages 27 to page 46.

16 Go ahead.

17 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. I'm Johnny Bhullar with
18 Caltrans. I do want to point out that on the agenda, if you
19 look at page 26, we do, I do want to point out a couple of
20 things, so that even though I see the rush of time, but I do
21 want to emphasize that we have been working on this effort
22 for almost a year now, that we did not bring on purpose to
23 the Committee because we wanted to make sure that we had
24 what we were working on satisfied as per the SHSP
25 requirements, but also as per the CBAC requirements, so as

1 we have been required that every time there's a bicycle
2 item, we do go to the CBAC. So, this item has been
3 recognized, first of all in the SHSP on page, just go to
4 page 27, on the agenda, it does say that under the
5 (indiscernible) for the SHSP, it says the California MUTCD
6 emphasizes the importance of accommodating bicyclist and
7 pedestrians in work zones, but does not provide sufficient
8 guidance on bicycles. So, basically this recognized that
9 the California MUTCD policies are there for bicyclists,
10 however, they are not being emphasized or sufficient usage
11 out in the field is not being done. So, in regards to that,
12 that's why we are bringing in this proposal. And this
13 proposal has been discussed at the CBAC on two different
14 meetings.

15 For that, I want to first invite Jim, so that he
16 can, Jim Baross, so that he can talk about at least what was
17 the CBAC stake on these items, before the CTCDC even
18 discusses the items, because we had to make certain changes
19 and make sure that the CBAC was happy with our
20 recommendation before we brought it to the Committee.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you.

22 Welcome.

23 MR. BAROSS: Thank you. I'm Jim Baross, I'm Vice
24 Chair of the CBAC, which for those of you who don't know is
25 the California Bicycle Advisory Committee to Caltrans.

1 We've seen this at least twice at the Committee, and do
2 approve and ask for modifications, and do approve what's
3 being provided. Also, I'm Co-Chair of the SHSP Challenge
4 Area 13. We brought this forward as a challenge, as an
5 action item because it was precipitated by several deaths in
6 California, directly, we think, related to construction zone
7 issues. We think it's important that this be adopted now,
8 so it can be part of the revised California MUTCD and I'd be
9 available for questions.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you very
11 much.

12 MR. BHULLAR: All right. Now, I'll introduce the
13 proposal and of course by no means am I expecting for us to
14 go through page by page and through all the details but, in
15 short basically what we are proposing here is recognizing
16 the fact that the policies are already there for bicyclists
17 and their treatment in work zones. Since they were not
18 being used out in the field that much, what we have done is,
19 in the first four typical applications that you're going to
20 see, the ones that are shown on page 31, page 33, for those
21 of you following me on the agenda, so on the first four
22 typical applications these are existing typical applications
23 in the current California MUTCD. And what we are suggesting
24 is just minor amendments, meaning trying to show the
25 optional signs for bicycles as well as the share of the

1 road, and because even though in the policies it said that
2 optionally you can use these, but they're free to sometimes
3 don't show it in the schedule of the diagrams, they often
4 get overlooked or not used that much.

5 So, the first four typical applications, which are
6 on page 31, page 33, page 35, and then page 38. So, in
7 these four typical applications, all we have done is we have
8 added the signs for the bicycle and the share of the road,
9 and tried to show on the figures that optionally the
10 engineer does have the option to use these signs. In a way
11 we are thinking by adding these signs there will be
12 engineers willfully thinking of the option, and probably
13 there will be more usage out in the field, wherever there is
14 a need. And then related to that, we are also making some
15 amendments to the notes to reflect what changes we are
16 proposing.

17 And in addition to that, there are four typical
18 applications that we are -- question?

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Can I stop you
20 right there. That pretty much covers Section 6G.05, before
21 jump into 6H-101 and the rest of it, do you want to have any
22 specific -- do you have any specific questions on pages from
23 28 through 38, do you have any specific questions or
24 comments on the diagrams or the text, as Mr. Bhullar is
25 presenting on those ten pages?

1 Let's go with Mr. Babico.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah. On the pages 31
3 and 33, they are calling for W16-1 to be optional. I would
4 like to see this to be mandatory, similar to the pages 40,
5 okay. The reason being is that if you leave the bicycle
6 symbol sign alone, many drivers, they think that that is a
7 bicycle crosswalk. But, with the text, would be a very
8 clear message that it is a shared facility, shared lane.
9 So, I would like to see it mandatory rather than optional.

10 MR. BHULLAR: When you say mandatory, you mean the
11 usage of the signs?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, meaning whenever you
13 have the W11-1 --

14 MR. BHULLAR: Oh, I see.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: -- you supplement it by
16 W16-01.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, because
18 you're using the same thing, on page 40, on page 40 16-1 is
19 not optional, it comes with 11-1.

20 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. I think maybe then I need to
21 correct that, because the intent here was that that is one
22 package, the symbol time for the bicycle and shared road is
23 one package, and when we say optional, we were meaning that
24 to be that both of them together as optional.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's not the

1 way the diagram shows.

2 MR. BHULLAR: All right, I'll make that
3 correction.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: The way the
5 diagram shows, it implies that only 16-1 is optional and
6 11-1 is mandatory.

7 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. I'll make the note but, that
8 was the intent.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, you might
10 want to clarify.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Then on page 35, the
12 northbound shows W-11 with W-16 optional, the southbound is
13 only bicycle symbol sign. Why?

14 MR. BHULLAR: Which page was that?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Thirty-five.

16 UNIDENTIFIED: (Indiscernible) both together --
17 (Asides, inaudible.)

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: So, I would like to have
19 both of them together.

20 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. I will correct that.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: And it doesn't show the
22 "Share the Road" sign.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Right.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Right, that's what he's
25 pointing out.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah.

2 MR. BHULLAR: Sure.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: His intent was both sign
4 in one package.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's pretty
6 much the same comment as the previous, make the diagram more
7 clear.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Likewise, 38, I would
9 like to have both signs. On page 42 --

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You jumped, we
11 are not to 42 yet.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Oh, I will hold my
13 horse.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Any other
15 comments, Mr. Babico?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: That's it.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yeah, first of all, I
19 think everyone is to be commended for the effort here, in
20 trying to bring awareness to everyone that they need to
21 consider bicyclist through work zones. And I want to
22 support it but I'm encountering several problems with this.

23 One is that the illustrations show "optional", the
24 red text shows "guidance", it's always a "should" condition.
25 The illustrations presume that there is either a bike lane

1 for an adequate shoulder that is accommodating bicyclists,
2 and it shows that we're taking it away because of the
3 detour, and therefore that this "Share the Road" bicycle
4 signing should be considered. I fully agree with it in
5 that context, when you're taking something away, make sure
6 you advise also that they know what the condition is. But,
7 there are situations on non-rural highways and city streets
8 where there is not side by side room for bicyclists, like in
9 a city street where you have two lanes and parking, there's
10 no room for te bicyclist. So, today, we don't, we are not
11 able to accommodate them. But, according to these diagrams,
12 when we implement a detour, we would have to have a "Share
13 the Road" sign, where we are not able to share the road
14 today. So, I think there needs to be some clarification
15 that where the shoulder is being eliminated or a bike lane
16 is being eliminated, that's when you want to use the signs.
17 But, not a situation where you don't have side by side
18 bicycle vehicle traffic today.

19 MR. BHULLAR: I think on note No. 10, on page 30,
20 does at least address for that situation for long term
21 duration projects. So, on page 30, note 10, it does say for
22 long term duration projects and/or if the road is inadequate
23 for line bicycles and motor vehicles to travel side by side,
24 then the bicycle and the "Share the Road" plaque should be
25 used to advise motorists of the presence of bicycles in the

1 travel lanes.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Right, but do I use it
3 today in the absence of a detour? In the absence of a
4 detour, am I supposed to post it today, when there's not
5 room for them? So, that's the only -- so, in summary, the
6 drawings say "option", the text says "should", and I think
7 we need to clarify that really it applies where you're
8 taking something away.

9 MR. BHULLAR: Good, thanks.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
11 comments, questions?

12 Mr. Knowles?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I had a couple of
14 questions. Low volume, is that defined as what the volume
15 was? In reading this it looks like high speed is anything
16 equal to or greater than 30?

17 MR. BHULLAR: The high speed, I think the way it's
18 defined is 30 or more is high speed in urban areas, and 25
19 or less is low speed, and that's how we have started
20 defining it as per our previous CTCDC recommendation to make
21 the changes in box six.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I was surprised that
23 high speed was such a low speed. So, I'm curious as to what
24 low volume, what that threshold is, because I can't find
25 that.

1 MR. BHULLAR: The low volume, I believe the way
2 it's defined is less than 400 ADT.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Less than 400.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It's mentioned in
5 the California MUTCD.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah, which block is
7 that?

8 MR. BHULLAR: Five. The part that's probably only
9 applicable in your county, Jacob, in the entire state.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Don't ask me about --
11 the same clarifying, so we're going to need clarification as
12 to the language changes on "options" in the word "should"
13 because early --

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It depends on the
15 nature of the comments, like Mr. Babico's comments it's like
16 more clarification, because the way that the diagram is
17 shown is kind of not maybe as clear as it can be. But the
18 question that Mr. Fisher raised as a more serious policy
19 question that we need to address, if these things are
20 optional or --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah, that's where it
22 became confusing to me from the very first display, when
23 we're talking about, on page 30, guidance and then option,
24 and then standard and then option, and standard and
25 guidance, and all of a sudden the language didn't seem to

1 jibe with the diagram, especially using "shoulds" instead of
2 "mays", so I became confused.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That was
4 Mr. Fisher's comment, yeah.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

6 MR. BHULLAR: Well, the usage of the signs
7 themselves was optional but the guidance sometimes is
8 alluding to certain other things, but, I do see the
9 disparity that it brings up, so we will amend the language.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But the guidance on the
11 optional sign is a "should", so it doesn't read, the text
12 doesn't read like the diagram should be, or even the edge
13 stripe on the very first one says "option" on the diagram
14 but says "should", and is under guidance under a standard in
15 the text. So, it's not --

16 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, we need to fix that.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Please clean that. And
18 that seems consistent throughout.

19 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah, at this time we are actually
20 looking for any comments, because by the next probably
21 meeting we want to have everything fixed, so that we are
22 looking for a recommendation.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You said your
24 deadline is June 2010, right?

25 MR. BHULLAR: June, yeah.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And then we will
2 have another Committee meeting before June, so.

3 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah, so at this time we want to
4 hear any concerns, questions, the more comments you give us,
5 the better it's going to help us, so that we can amend the
6 proposal.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And my last comment, I
8 was going to say actually the deadline is like the middle of
9 June, because I think there's an Executive meeting in the
10 middle of June, and by that time we have to have, you know,
11 we should have had these posted on the website. So, that
12 gives you an idea where we're at, where we need to be.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: We'll probably
14 schedule our next meeting sometime in April.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: My last comment, if I
16 interpret the text right, on page 35, you're calling the one
17 single lane a shoulder lane, and the text refers to the
18 minimum, which is being three meters to ten feet. But it's
19 helpful to have that on the diagram, because once my civil
20 engineers bring in K-rails and everything else, we start
21 arguing over just exactly what is that width. And even if
22 you're doing cones, I mean it sounds ridiculous maybe but,
23 it would almost be nice to have a blowup of the diagram that
24 if you have base plates on your posts and they're going into
25 the ten feet, you know, exactly ten feet from what to what,

1 because I get -- I strain to get ten feet, because of
2 everything that intrudes into that space, especially the
3 rubber bases of posts. You know, is it ten foot clear,
4 completely clear for the cyclists and for the motorists
5 sharing that very narrow space?

6 MR. BHULLAR: Well, we will try to do a diagram
7 and show, okay.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: A blowup of that
9 detail.

10 MR. BHULLAR: Sure.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Babico?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Aren't these figures
13 identical exactly per the existing California MUTCD, except
14 we are editing the bicycle symbol signs?

15 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. As you can see, the first four
16 figures that we are discussing right now, they are existing
17 California MUTCD figures, and the one thing --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Except the red color.

19 MR. BHULLAR: -- except the red --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: That's what I'm saying.

21 But Jeff, going back to what Jeff was saying about these
22 are approved illustrations.

23 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Only he is adding the
25 bicycle symbol sign.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You're only --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: -- and the note No. 3.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You're only
4 looking at the red additions to the diagrams. The rest of
5 the diagram is already approved.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: That's what I'm saying
7 but Jeff had some comments.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right, because I saw
9 some blue text in here also.

10 MR. BHULLAR: Even blue is existing. That's what
11 we have right now.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah, well, just so you
13 know, especially for the cyclists that are concerned, one of
14 the battles we fight is what all can encroach into this
15 minimum ten foot space, and there's all kinds of things, so
16 that I don't really end up with ten feet of usable pavement
17 in these construction zones.

18 MR. BHULLAR: We will try to see if we can show it
19 here, but as I'm trying to point out, and Jacob was
20 suggesting, the black is existing California MUTCD in the
21 text, what is blue, blue, all it means is that is existing
22 current California amended text, and the red is what we are
23 proposing as the changes now, as per this proposal.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay. And that's where
25 the options and the shoulds conflict.

1 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But just to let you
3 know, as far as a point of clarification, those minimum
4 widths are an issue.

5 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Any other
7 questions or comments on these ten pages?

8 Jim, do you want to make some clarification?

9 MR. BAROSS: First off, we appreciate the
10 attention, let's get it right but, let's get to it, because
11 of the immediacy we have. I did, because of the time, and
12 I had asked several people to come to both learn how this
13 process works and what it takes to sit through meetings, but
14 also so they don't each get up and provide comment
15 individually, I'd like to ask them to stand.

16 If you've come to this meeting with the intent of
17 providing support to the bicycling issues, would you please
18 stand to show the folks here.

19 Applause is not necessary. Thank you very much
20 for your attendance. Some people had to leave and the
21 weather has certainly cut us down.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: We definitely
23 appreciate the commitment, especially in weather like this,
24 and spending time listening to all these other issues we
25 have to go through, we appreciate it.

1 MR. BAROSS: One content to a comment that was
2 made by Mr. Fisher. The "Share the Road" sign, we're glad
3 to have it available. It's been several years, I think
4 about 12 years since we got it adopted and expanded its use.

5 But, we found that it's ambiguous and the ambiguity was
6 shown here. "Share the Road" could mean side by side
7 sharing, and of course we're happy to find opportunities to
8 operate on the roadway without slowing down motor vehicle
9 operators with side by side sharing, but sharing the road
10 also means in-line sharing, when the road is not wide enough
11 to share side by side. But the "Share the Road" sign
12 doesn't make it, it doesn't seem to get across to most
13 people.

14 The Federal MUTCD, which you will be reviewing
15 over the next year and hopefully adopting the parts that I
16 want, includes a "Bikes May Use Full Lane" sign, which will
17 be applicable when the lane is too narrow to share side by
18 side, which I would expect we would be revisiting this
19 construction zone and considering replacing the "Share the
20 Road" sign with a "Bikes May Use Full Lane" sign, when it's
21 applicable. Thanks.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you,
23 I appreciate the clarification.

24 Johnny?

25 MR. BHULLAR: With that I do want to add something

1 that I didn't mention here, is that while I was working on
2 this typical applications, I was creating new ones as I was
3 amending the existing ones. We tried to limit ourselves to
4 stay within the tool box that is available right now,
5 meaning the signs that are official today. So, I did not
6 want to entertain new signs to make matters more complex.
7 So, in the future we might make some amendments but, once we
8 get there, we'll worry about it.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Do you
10 want to continue with the rest of the package?

11 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. Then continuing on, starting
12 with the page 39, so starting with page 39, we created four
13 typical applications, because there is, as you might recall,
14 there are two typical applications right now that are
15 devoted to pedestrians, which are T-28 and T-29, for those
16 of you familiar. Since there are two applications devoted
17 just to pedestrians here, what we wanted to do was, rather
18 than or in addition to just amending four existing typical
19 applications where a bicyclist options usage might be
20 helpful, we wanted to create four typical applications
21 depending upon the need. We created these four typical
22 applications which are devoted only when the decision has
23 already been made that there are bicyclist in the work
24 zones, and we are going to now accommodate those bicyclists,
25 and how are we going to go about it. So, these are devoted

1 of course with that caveat that the decision has been made.

2 So, in these particular situations, what are you going to
3 do? The first one is for page 40, it's shoulder closure on
4 urban low speed locations to accommodate the bicyclist. So,
5 the conditions are already there, which is that it's going
6 to be an urban low speed, meaning 25 miles or less in an
7 urban setting. And there is a shoulder, and the shoulder
8 was being used by bicyclists, and now we are closing that
9 shoulder. So, having said that, this is a typical
10 application we are proposing, which is 6H-101, as well as
11 the notes that go with it.

12 The second one is on page 42, which is for a
13 higher speed situation, and again it is an example of how
14 things can be done, and by showing a figure of course it
15 will encourage more to start doing it. And in this case,
16 6H-102, what it talks about is when you are going to close a
17 shoulder on a higher speed, meaning 30 or more, 30 miles or
18 more, or in rural or freeway/expressway type of situation
19 where there are bicyclists that were using that shoulder and
20 now we are going to take that should away. So, having
21 already given those conditions, then how are you going to go
22 about accommodating the bicyclists in that type of
23 situation. So, we show an example of how that can be done,
24 with the notes that go with it.

25 The third typical application is on page 44, and

1 this one is for an urban setting where the detours have been
2 made, so the detour has been made for all vehicles, but
3 trying to make sure that the bicyclists are also encouraged
4 to go through this detour, so there are signs for the
5 vehicle detours but, in addition to that, there are bicycle
6 detour signs that are encouraging the bicyclist to go around
7 the detour, meaning that that has been checked out, because
8 once you have the bicycle detour sign it means that someone
9 has checked out that facility or the detour facility does
10 accommodate the bicyclists when they want to go around.

11 And the fourth one is the typical application on
12 page 46, and this is a right lane closure on bike lanes at
13 far side of the intersection, as shown in the figure. In
14 this case, again, basically just adding the bicycle and the
15 "Share the Road" signs and trying to show the condition. In
16 this case, again, what happens when you have a bike lane,
17 and there was a bike lane next to of course the two thru
18 lanes, and that bike lane is now being interrupted by some
19 construction activity on the far side of the intersection.
20 How is a bicyclist, who was used to his bike lane traveling
21 through the intersection, through what is he supposed to do,
22 or what the engineer should be doing to let the motorist
23 know, as well as the bicyclist know how to navigate this
24 intersection.

25 So, these are the four typical applications we are

1 proposing, along with the notes that go along with these
2 four typical applications.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Johnny, one quick
4 question, on the 46, I saw the other one, I think it pretty
5 much had it down, on 46 when you're recommending the
6 installation of the W11-1 and W16-1 package, you're not
7 specific as to the distance. You're just saying somewhere
8 between A and B, that area. Is that what -- so that
9 distance is not, does not need to be specified, just based
10 on field conditions?

11 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

13 MR. BHULLAR: Because the A and B distances are
14 dependent upon the major activity going on, so, yeah.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, okay.
16 Those you have in the table, but this is going to be at the
17 discretion in the field. Okay.

18 So, any other -- let's go on these pages that
19 Johnny started, from page 38 -- did you start 38, yes.

20 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Thirty-nine.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thirty-nine,
22 sorry. Thank you, Devinder. From 39 to the 48, the rest
23 of the package.

24 Mr. Babico?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Number one is the signs

1 M4-9-A series, are these new signs?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Which diagram are
3 you talking about?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Oh, page 42.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Page 42.

6 MR. BHULLAR: No, actually these are the 9A, B and
7 C, these are existing signs that are in the current
8 California MUTCD, and the very reason why, as pointed out by
9 you, the very reason why we are proposing them here is
10 because no one is even aware that these signs exist. And by
11 showing them in some typical applications like these, that's
12 when the engineers will become aware.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: They are there.

14 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, they are there.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. Now this page --

16 MR. BHULLAR: Because no one notices the signs
17 until they get put into some typical applications.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay.

19 MR. BHULLAR: So, I think we are getting tested
20 here by you pointing that out.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. Now, this figure
22 shows that you do have at least, before the construction,
23 that you have a bike route, at least a bike route but you
24 are, because of the construction zone, you are creating a
25 bike path. Is that the intent?

1 MR. BHULLAR: When you say bike route or bike
2 path, what I think --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Because you are
4 separating the bike way from the traffic by putting those
5 K-rails.

6 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, because basically here what's
7 happening is the shoulder was being used by the bicyclist.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: So, the shoulder is used
9 as a bike route.

10 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I see.

12 MR. BHULLAR: And now that shoulder has been taken
13 away by construction activity, so we are showing one
14 possible scenario or a way of handling this situation for
15 bicyclists, by separating them with a physically separated
16 barrier.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: The notion is not -- if
18 this project work zone takes about six months or a year, and
19 the bicyclists used to use that as a bike path, then after
20 the completion of the project it would go back to bike
21 route. Do you see any problem with that?

22 MR. BHULLAR: Maybe there are more experts in the
23 room that might be able to answer that.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Because they are
25 protected.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You need to move
2 to the podium so he can hear you and he can record it. You
3 don't need to run, we have plenty of time, don't worry.

4 MS. KEEYAN: My name is Kathy Keeyan, I'm the
5 Executive Director of the San Diego County Bicycle
6 Coalition. And we have an example in San Diego County of
7 just that situation, where along the I-15 they were doing,
8 Caltrans was doing construction along the bridge over Lake
9 Hodges, and for an extended period of time there was a
10 shoulder available that was clear, then during the
11 construction it was K-railed off to provide specific space
12 for cyclists to use the shoulder. And then when the
13 construction was done after, I'm not sure, how long it was
14 but, at least a year, that K-rail was removed and the
15 shoulder was replaced back, and it has not been an issue for
16 us.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you, and
18 good to see you. We always run into each other in SANDAC
19 meetings.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: On Freeway 15?

21 MS. KEEYAN: Interstate 15, yes, bikes are allowed
22 to --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: And you allow a bike
24 route?

25 MS. KEEYAN: Yes. Bikes are allowed to use the

1 shoulder across Lake Hodges.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you. And
3 there are other examples also in Santa Barbara County.

4 Johnny? Okay. So, any other comments, questions?

5 Mr. Fisher?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yes. The drawings on page 40
7 and 42 refer to urban streets, yet the drawing is shown as
8 if it were really a rural street with the shoulder. In
9 urban areas, you can have a shoulder where you allow
10 parking, and therefore there was no usable space for the
11 bicyclists. So, I think there needs to be a clarification
12 that refers to a usable shoulder without parking, or
13 something to that effect, to clarify when we would use this
14 treatment. And that would apply then to both the figures on
15 pages 40 and 42. But, also, I think it would be helpful to
16 also illustrate a bicycle lane, and show the treatment where
17 you actually have a designated bicycle lane.

18 MR. BHULLAR: So, would it be okay then if we were
19 to have the 6H-101 probably showing a bike lane in the urban
20 setting, would that be more appropriate?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, it could be either
22 a bike lane or a usable shoulder. We have to be careful
23 that we clarify it's a usable shoulder because, again, in
24 urban areas parking is generally allowed, in rural areas
25 it's not generally allowed.

1 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: And I think as long we
3 make that clarification, then we've given good guidance to
4 the urban transportation.

5 MR. BHULLAR: Well, probably I'll amend the figure
6 to show a little bit more of an urban type of street
7 configuration, so that it clarifies the situation even
8 better.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yeah. 6H-101 just says
10 urban slow speed --

11 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: -- but figure 6H-102
13 says urban or rural for expressway or a freeway.

14 MR. BHULLAR: Urban high speed, okay.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So, I think the more
16 illustrations we have, the better.

17 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. I'll try to do that.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: And then clarify that on
19 6H-102 that this treatment would apply not only where you're
20 taking away either usable shoulder or a designated bike
21 lane, but also the sidewalk path, because you may have a
22 sidewalk path here that you haven't taken away. So, in
23 urban areas you would encounter those situations, I just
24 think the more illustration, the more clarification, the
25 better.

1 MR. BHULLAR: Thanks.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: For the benefit
3 -- I saw a hand raised, after we are done with the Committee
4 discussion, I'll open it for the public, so if you have
5 comments, please take notes.

6 Okay. Mr. Mansourian, you have?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yes. To follow up
8 on what John said, what would really help us, because I
9 think first of all this is great work, thank you, I think if
10 we would label these pages, this is I'm talking about seven
11 months from now where our engineers have to open this up, if
12 you would be label that, if you're doing a construction,
13 exactly what you said, Johnny. And you're taking away a
14 bike lane during construction.

15 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The next one, if
17 you're going a construction rural roadway that the
18 bicyclists use a shoulder, here is what we do. And then I
19 want to share with you a dilemma that I see and we have, I
20 don't have a solution. On page 42, where we use the symbol
21 of pedestrian and a bicycle, our ADA experts have told us we
22 cannot just divert pedestrians into anything. That it needs
23 to be fully ADA compatible. So, if we close a shoulder, we
24 close the sidewalk for example, and put a K-rail and put the
25 bikes and pedestrians behind the K-rail, it doesn't work.

1 Because it needs to meet the ADA, the cross slope and all of
2 that, how you get on and how you get off. So, I don't have
3 a solution. I can see this sign M4-9A got us in trouble
4 because advocates came and measured and they said no, you
5 can't use that. So, I'm just pointing that out.

6 MR. BHULLAR: Sure.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I don't have a
8 solution but, labeling and more illustration is really good.

9 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Thank you.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Knowles?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I was noticing on these
13 sheets that you're not using the phrase "Optional" with
14 regard to the "Bicycle" and "Share the Road" sign stacks
15 but, the language in the text says "May". So, I think that
16 the "Optional" is missing from --

17 MR. BHULLAR: No, no, on purpose we did that
18 because these four typical applications are when you have
19 already made the determination that you are going to be
20 accommodating the bicyclist. So, for that reason then they
21 are no longer optional because these are the ones you will
22 use.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, then you're going
24 to have to take the "Mays", I would assume, out of the red
25 text.

1 MR. BHULLAR: Well, the "Mays" probably are all
2 not alluding directly to the usage of the bicycle signs.
3 They are probably like, for example on page --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, on page 43, No.
5 13, "Long Term Duration Projects, the Share the Road bicycle
6 marking may be used." Is that marking and not sign?

7 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah, the marking. Marking is
8 optional in addition to the sign, you may use the marking or
9 no.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So, these signs are
11 mandatory in all cases?

12 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, once you make the determination
13 that you are going to be accommodating the bicyclist, we
14 need it.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Unlike the first
16 four.

17 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, that's the
19 reason we kind of separated them a little bit. The first
20 four addressed a different set of circumstances, these four
21 another.

22 MR. BHULLAR: These are once you made the
23 determination, then this is how you're going to go about and
24 do them, so then the signs don't stay an option anymore.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Oh. Then my other

1 concern would be some kind of a minimum width for the
2 curbside lane, because in examples of cities where the
3 curbside lane is 20 feet wide, just because we're doing some
4 shoulder work, I would think there would be some minimum
5 we'd go down to before we need the separate lane, because --

6 MR. BHULLAR: I see.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- you could close off
8 the shoulder and still have 15 or 16 feet, and I don't know
9 that I'd still go forward with a protected bicycle area when
10 I still have enough with four, you know, the cars and the
11 bikes to be side by side. I just wanted to comment though,
12 on page 44, keeping track of all the detour signs, plus
13 having the "Bicycles Share the Road" signs, I just, in the
14 real world, I don't know how that's practical. We have a
15 hard enough time just maintaining the existing detour signs.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Especially if you
17 are doing it in a small grid, downtown kind of setting, it
18 can be challenging. That's why I said about the spacing and
19 all that, sometimes the spacing may not work well. We'll
20 see.

21 Any other questions, comments?

22 (No response.)

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. This is a
24 public hearing item, I'm going to open it to members of the
25 public, anybody who wishes to address the Committee on this

1 issue.

2 Chad?

3 MR. DORINSIDE: Chad Dorinside, Best Highway
4 Safety Practices Institute. I understand where everybody is
5 going with this bicycle rule but, the signs, as illustrated,
6 are find if you're in a fixed facility but, being an ex-
7 contractor that had a half dozen vehicles a day doing
8 traffic control, the logistics of handling these signs is
9 going to be insane. More importantly, the "Bicycles Share
10 the Road" can't be done in a temporary device. In other
11 words, when you start putting that much sail area up in a
12 high wind situation, you won't be able to maintain it, nor
13 can you get the sign high enough for the "Share of the Road"
14 blowup properly. In other words, if you're going to do a
15 bicycle sign in a temporary device, you have to have a sign
16 that has the whole message on a single placard. It just
17 doesn't lend itself to temporary traffic control.

18 So, I would think, when you look at a temporary
19 traffic control device on this little triangle, what will
20 suffice to meet this need, because you can't put the
21 multiple signs on a single device, and it won't live in the
22 field if there's any wind at all. You'll have space
23 problems getting it in there besides that.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, than you.
25 Any other members of the public? My old friend, how are

1 you, come on up.

2 MR. ZABIR: My name is ZABIR (phonetic) and I'm
3 with the City of Poway here in San Diego, and I have one
4 comment and one, I guess observation. On the page 30, where
5 the last three items are guidance, and those are under
6 options, so I think this, Johnny, may be a good place to use
7 those whizzle word (phonetic, sic), if used, then you shall
8 do this or you should do this. So, the first one is the
9 option, you use it or don't use it but, if you use it, you
10 shall do this and this.

11 MR. BHULLAR: Which, you're on page 30?

12 MR. ZABIR: Thirty, on the guidance.

13 MR. BHULLAR: Which item number?

14 MR. ZABIR: I think the tenth one you guys
15 discussed, it said "should", and then you were talking it
16 says, "option", but it's under guidance, because the sign
17 isn't optional. So, I'm just putting it for you guys, you
18 know, there is those whiz words that we use in the MUTCD and
19 it says if used, you shall do this or do that, even though
20 it's under option, but it's still a guidance for that
21 option.

22 MR. BHULLAR: Good point.

23 MR. ZABIR: And then on the barriers, on page 42,
24 or go to the picture, it depicts K-rails, you know, I don't
25 understand, from this, that it says barrier with lights, so

1 barricades would be okay. Cones would be okay. I mean the
2 way I understand it. Does it have to be concrete barriers
3 or just barriers?

4 MR. BHULLAR: Physical barriers.

5 MR. ZABIR: Physical barriers, right. So, as long
6 as it's a physical, something that separates the travel or
7 the cars from the walking pedestrian or bicyclist, then it's
8 fine. I mean does it have to be concrete barriers, as long
9 as it's separated? Something separates them. So, I don't
10 know that the intent is that we put only K-rails or Jersey
11 rails, you know, concrete barriers, or we can do, you know,
12 type two barricade or type one barricade, whatever it is,
13 with the flashing beacons on them. Would that satisfy this
14 condition or not?

15 MR. BHULLAR: No, because the high speed has to be
16 barriers, that was the intent, so we need to clarify that.

17 MR. ZABIR: Right. Okay.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Good point, thank
19 you. Good points, as always.

20 MR. BHULLAR: Thanks, ZABIR. Only a guy from
21 working on the National Committee can give me some reasoned
22 words, so thanks, ZABIR.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: If you show up at
24 the National Committee meetings.

25 Sir?

1 MR. LEONE: For the stenographer, Robert Leone,
2 San Diego County Bicycle Coalition.

3 On page 46 the, "Right Lane Must Turn Right" sign,
4 is that an existing traffic control device that's not
5 associated with the construction?

6 MR. BHULLAR: No, that is an existing sign but
7 it's going to be placed in this particular situation, but
8 it's going to stay black on white because it's a regular
9 sign but, it's going to be placed only because of the work
10 zone activity.

11 MR. LEONE: Okay. There is available, I don't
12 know the specific number in the Traffic Control Device Code,
13 a "Right Turn Lane Yield to Bicycle" sign, was that
14 considered for this application?

15 MR. BHULLAR: I'm not aware of that sign has been
16 approved yet, and I think it is in the National MUTCD
17 probably but, I don't think it is in the California MUTCD.

18 MR. LEONE: I thought I saw it off the Caltrans
19 website.

20 MR. BHULLAR: Okay, then I'll look into that and
21 maybe that is something that we can use here.

22 MR. LEONE: Okay, thank you.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you. That
24 is a good point. Actually all the speakers, you had very
25 good points.

1 Any other members of the public?

2 (No response.)

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Seeing none, we
4 close the public hearing. Back to the Committee. Okay.

5 Mr. Fisher?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: I just noted one other
7 thing, because of the gentleman who brought up figure 6H-
8 104, we show all the signs associated with this detour,
9 we've apparently removed some of the pavement markings
10 related to the bike lane approaching and departing from the
11 intersection but, we didn't appropriately strike the
12 mandatory right turn lane and I think maybe we need to fix
13 that. Maybe show it as a solid line and with a pavement
14 arrow in it, rather than marked as a thru lane.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: good.

16 MR. BHULLAR: Well, so even for long term probably
17 that arrow would be good, because otherwise the arrow is not
18 supposed to be there, the pavement mark for the right turn
19 only.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Right, but we've removed
21 the pavement markings related to the bike lane near the
22 intersection.

23 MR. BHULLAR: No, that is actually the current
24 practice, not only close it to the intersection, the bike
25 lane stops.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: It's normally dashed,
2 right?

3 MR. BHULLAR: It's dashed.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Close
5 intersection.

6 MR. BHULLAR: I don't think it's necessarily
7 dashed, sometimes it is just dropped off.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, it's a trap lane.
9 I guess what I'm asking is, if we're entrapping a motorist
10 to turn right and this is more than a one day detour, don't
11 we have an obligation then to put in the pavement markings
12 that suggest that?

13 MR. BHULLAR: so, would that be probably like an
14 optional note or you think we should show it on the figure,
15 and just mark it as optional, the arrow marking?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, we've got a truck
17 or a hole on the far side of the intersection, and the
18 motorist is used to traveling the number two lane for many
19 miles as a thru lane. So, I think in combination with
20 posting the signing, I think we need the pavement markings
21 to show that it's a mandatory right turn lane.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, you're
23 suggesting to show the solid white and the arrow.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: And the pavement arrow,
25 right.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. If you
2 consider that. Any other suggestions? Oh, well, go on,
3 we'll make an exception in your case, since you drove all
4 the way from Long Beach.

5 MR. ROSEMAN: I think on that situation, if it's
6 long term, yeah, you would strike it but otherwise you would
7 take out the number two lane with conage, so you'd cone it
8 out and then you'd open it back up to allow right turn, and
9 you'd have to accommodate the bike lane, the bike traffic
10 that may want to move forward, as well as bike traffic that
11 may want to make a right. So, I think what's missing is the
12 cones.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Could you also
14 introduce yourself for the reporter?

15 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah. Dave Roseman, City Traffic
16 Engineer, City of Long Beach. So, it's missing the conage,
17 in my opinion.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Any other
19 comments, questions, suggestions, advice, wisdom?

20 (No response.)

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Go for it.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, you've
23 heard the Committee, you heard some very good comments from
24 members of the public and the Bicycle Coalition, and so
25 where do we go from here? You just take it back and make

1 the revisions and come back at next meeting?

2 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Do we incorporate
3 these comments and finalize.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: That's what I want, I
6 want to incorporate your comments and finalize it.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And get the
8 motion as recommended.

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: And encourage, if we
10 have more comments, that we let him know between now, so we
11 don't come up with more.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, yeah,
13 because this is pretty extensive, this is like 20 pages of
14 standards that we are talking about, so if --

15 MR. BHULLAR: What we're willing to do is probably
16 make those edits and share them with the Committee members,
17 but if we can get at least the recommendation to go ahead.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Good idea, if you
19 can share the 19, 20 pages again after you have done the
20 changes, before the next meeting.

21 MR. BHULLAR: No, what we're asking the approval
22 in this meeting, and we will share the changes with the
23 Committee.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Is that what you
25 want to do?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I want to basically get
2 approval to go ahead, and we're more than willing to share
3 what we're doing until the last minute. I don't want to be
4 voting on this again at the next meeting, because that's
5 going to ruin somebody's Memorial Day weekend, so let's
6 just, you know, I think we've got enough and it was pretty
7 clear what the suggestions were, that we can those
8 suggestions, and I didn't hear any that I couldn't live
9 with, and so we'll go with them.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And we can share.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: And we will share with
12 the Committee.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, I hear you.

14 Okay, so I didn't hear either any comments or suggestions
15 that gives anybody heartburn, either the members here or the
16 bicycle experts so, you need a motion to approve with the
17 recommended suggestions and comments.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes.

19 MR. BHULLAR: That's what we need.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I heard you.

21 Okay. Who is the brave soul who wants to make the motion?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'll make the motion.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It's your item,
24 of course you can. Okay, so what's your motion?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: My motion is to

1 basically accept our drawings and our suggested changes to
2 the MUTCD with your recommendations.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And the members
4 of the public.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: And the members of the
6 public, yes.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Is there a second
8 on the motion?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I'll second for
10 discussion.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. There is a
12 motion and a second, now discussion. If you don't have
13 discussion we're going to go to vote.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I don't know if the
15 concern is that they'd like to see the final product, that's
16 what I sense from the Committee's, way too much material
17 but, I also hear weigh ins that I don't want to start this
18 all over again and nitpick it.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Let me explain. This is
20 obviously just the first step in a long journey and so, you
21 know, we're basically going to put this on the website and
22 then we'll be, you know, probably coming up in future
23 meetings to tweak it and maybe add some more typical
24 applications and that sort of thing as time goes by.

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Before we finalize,

1 we'll share the document and if you have any comments at
2 that time you can provide it.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: You know, if the
4 Committee is concerned, there is one hybrid option and the
5 hybrid option could be that it is the intent of the
6 Committee to approve this, so we've closed the public
7 hearing, it is our intent to approve this at the next
8 meeting by taking a look at all the revisions that the
9 public and the Committee has requested.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I understand
11 that, and I understand Mr. Henley's concern also. If they
12 go and do all these changes, they don't want to come back
13 and restart discussing this all over again and we give them
14 new direction and say oh, we don't like this, we don't like
15 that. If we have any of those concerns, we have to say it
16 now.

17 Mr. Fisher?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: The concern I have is
19 that some of the things we discussed require extensive
20 changes. To tweak the language to say when it's an option
21 versus a should and when it's a take away of one versus it's
22 not, I want to approve this but, I want to make sure that
23 then Caltrans gets it right if this is our last action on
24 it.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: If the next

1 Committee meeting is in April, will that accommodate your
2 schedule so Johnny doesn't have to work the Memorial Day
3 weekend?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: If it's early April.
5 No, we should hope we would be a lot closer to what, you
6 know, what the Committee really wants at the end so, you
7 know, we'll go as far as we can I guess and we'll bring it
8 up to the next meeting.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: We still have a
10 motion and a second, we have to dispose of that somehow.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: You know, one hybrid
12 option would be to approve in concept with the understanding
13 that between now and the next meeting you would share with
14 the Committee members the draft text, and as long as we all
15 agree that it met the intent, you know, we could give you
16 those comments and you could move forward on it. You may
17 have an oversight and we just want to make sure we've
18 corrected it in between time. So, we could approve in
19 concept with the understanding that you would review the
20 draft text with us, just to make sure we got it right.

21 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: That's what we're
22 asking for.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: You mentioned one of the
24 issues had to do with the ADA, and the fact that you're
25 mixing it could be ADA and bicycles, and that may be an

1 insolvable problem in the next two months but that shouldn't
2 stop the whole thing, just because of that.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: No, I think that's easy.
4 I think you just have to say see section such and such that
5 talks about ADA requirements.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Jim, do you have
7 something to share?

8 MR. BAROSS: This kind of gets to the issue later
9 in the day about bicycle representatives on the Committee
10 but, I won't go into it. If there's going to be another
11 review, I would like Jesse and the gang to bring their
12 modified proposal to the California Bicycle Advisory
13 Committee, which will meet in February, so there's plenty of
14 time to provide that input for your evaluation, if it's not
15 approved today.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Sure, understood.
17 Thank you. Okay. So, do you want to restate your motion
18 again, Mr. Henley?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'd prefer Mr. Fisher
20 make -- I'll withdraw mine.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. The motion
22 is withdrawn. Mr. Fisher?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: And Mr. Fisher can make
24 it.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: I'll move that we

1 approve these guidelines in concept with the understanding
2 that the comments that we've provided today will be
3 incorporated, and that the Committee members will have an
4 opportunity to review that draft language and provide
5 feedback before the next CTCDC meeting.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And the revised
7 language be provided to CBAC in their February meeting.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: That's a different
9 matter. That's a Caltrans issue, the Committee doesn't tell
10 them where to go.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, I'm not going to
12 go there because I don't know their arrangement.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's correct,
14 that's another issue. Okay. So, you have a motion, is
15 there a second to Mr. Fisher's motion?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I second it.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. There's a
18 motion and second, do we need to discuss anymore?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So the
20 clarification, so this is not coming back to us?

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It will, it will
22 come back.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Not the way John
24 said it.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, no, it will

1 come back.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: It will come back.
3 Well, my understanding is that we're acting on it today and
4 anything between now and the next meeting is we're reviewing
5 just to make sure that they've properly incorporated our
6 comments without, and we provide feedback to them, but we
7 would not have to take new action on this, and that we are
8 taking action today. In other words, we're trusting you're
9 going to work with us to get it right.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And if you have a
11 specific comment, just work with Johnny one on one, you
12 don't have to wait until next meeting. When he sends the
13 revised language, if you have issues, concerns, share with
14 him.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: That sounds great.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So, we're approving
17 this today?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yeah.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: It's not coming back
20 in April?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: We're approving it in
22 concept, right.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well, it will come back,
24 you know, as an information item.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It comes back as

1 an information item. So, that's the motion and the second.

2 We have a second from Mr. Babico. Any other discussion?

3 (No response.)

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. All those
5 in favor?

6 (Ayes.)

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Opposition?

8 (No response.)

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.
10 Thanks Johnny, thanks Jesse.

11 MR. BHULLAR: Thank you.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. There is
13 one quick, I was told this is a very quick item, that's Item
14 10-4, what's that one about? Experiment with Bicycle Box at
15 Signalized Intersection. This is submitted by Caltrans
16 District 5. It says Mr. Henley.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. Bicycle boxes are
18 not, you know, are not unique to California, if you follow
19 the literature at all. They're being put in and tried all
20 over the country, as far as I know. Anyway, in the San Luis
21 Obispo area, they are proposing to put up a bike box at an
22 intersection in downtown San Luis Obispo, and we have Dario
23 Senor here, who is going to explain to what they propose to
24 do for their experiment.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Welcome.

1 MR. SENOR: Can we get -- Devinder is not here
2 but, I was going to get it on the screen, it would help if
3 it's on the screen. Can we do that?

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You might want to
5 start, he will come back. Don't hold up.

6 MR. SENOR: Okay. Well, thank you Committee for
7 having me. My name is Dario Senor, I'm with Caltrans
8 District 5 in San Luis Obispo. And I've brought here Adam
9 Fukushima, and he is actually our Bike Coordinator for
10 District 5. I'm the Bike Coordinator just for Traffic
11 Operations.

12 So, I guess you all have, you're all looking at
13 it, right, I guess since it's not on the screen but,
14 basically the situation that we're faced with here is, if
15 you're looking on page 71, inside the blue circle, you can
16 see what we have is a Class 2 approaching an intersection
17 with a free right lane, so that bicycles have to cross over
18 the free right to get to the actual intersection. The
19 conflict at this intersection here is, if you look at the
20 No. 2 lane, it's a shared left and a thru. When you're
21 sitting there in the Class 2, you don't know if the car
22 that's next to you is going through or going left. So,
23 that's where the conflict comes in.

24 As far as testing the experiment, luckily we
25 haven't had any collisions with bikes, so I don't actually

1 have data to do before and after. What I do have is a lot
2 of complaints. So, our testing would not be with data,
3 collision data, it would be more compliance. We would see
4 how vehicles are complying with stopping when we move the
5 stop bar. And you can see that on the next page.

6 If you can turn to page 72, I've just kind of
7 mocked up the bicycle box, what it is, the distance there is
8 20 feet, which is just their standard car length. I figured
9 one car length is enough. Like Wayne had said, there aren't
10 any standards because this hasn't really been done. These
11 do exist. There are a couple in the state in San Francisco,
12 and I believe in Long Beach, and they also use them in
13 Vancouver and in Portland a lot. Portland, as far as I
14 know, has received Federal approval to do it.

15 So, the point of it is to get the bike in front of
16 the vehicles, so that all the bikes can get in front of the
17 cars, and if the car does choose to go straight, the bicycle
18 will already be out of the way before that conflict actually
19 happens.

20 On page 73, you can see it's just a little bit
21 better because it's a striving plan. It would be, the line
22 would be dashed going up to the bike box, in order to get
23 the bike to be able to get into the box. I discussed this
24 issue originally, and I thought that what we were trying to
25 do here didn't even require any experimental approval,

1 because we weren't actually violating anything in the MUTCD
2 or the CVC. I discussed it with Johnny Bhullar though, and
3 he told me that actually the one violation is that we're
4 providing a double stop bar for two different modes of
5 transportation. One would be for bikes, one would be for
6 vehicles. So, that's pretty much where -- that's the only
7 thing really that I'm asking for experimental approval on,
8 because that is true.

9 The other thing, if you turn the page, actually is
10 just this is kind of an after thing but, we have discussed
11 this with the City of San Luis Obispo, this is right inside
12 San Luis Obispo, it's also the intersection in front of our
13 District Office, which makes it nice because Adam and I can
14 watch it on a daily basis, so we'll have really good data.
15 The City of San Luis Obispo recently put in a bicycle
16 boulevard and they made a custom stencil, which is the one
17 that's on page 75, and it's seven feet wide by eight feet
18 tall, which for me personally, I would rather have a bigger
19 bike stencil there than the standard one, which is on page
20 74, which is only four feet wide, six feet tall. I mean
21 that one would still work, if we don't receive approval for
22 the experimental one but, I would rather go with the one
23 that's actually stretched out a little more, just because it
24 takes up more of the lane and I think as a driver approaches
25 it, they'd see it better.

1 We've also discussed these -- we have a San Luis
2 Obispo Bike Coalition, which the letter is attached in
3 there, they fully support it. And we've also discussed it
4 with the City of San Luis Obispo. I'm going to let Adam
5 talk a little bit about education, because he's come up with
6 some ideas for how we would get the public educated on this
7 situation.

8 MR. FUKUSHIMA: Hello, Adam Fukushima, I'm the
9 Bike Coordinator for Caltrans District 5. We have basically
10 two objectives with an outreach and education campaign. One
11 is to alert motorists as to what this facility is and how to
12 use it. The other is to alert bicyclists on what it is and
13 how to use it.

14 The City of Portland has put together a pretty
15 good education outreach campaign, and we intend to use a lot
16 of their best literature and adapt it to this situation.
17 We'll also be working with the San Luis Obispo County
18 Bicycle Coalition. They have a grant, an educational grant,
19 through the City of San Luis Obispo, and they'll be using
20 that money to put together brochures, press releases,
21 information on public access television, using their email
22 blasts to their members and so on. So, we're hoping to
23 really get the word out if this experimentation is allowed
24 to go through. Thank you.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Just one quick

1 question, Mr. Senor. The Bicycle Boulevard, is that like a
2 normal street, I see the cars parked, so you just call it a
3 Bicycle Boulevard. Is that what you're doing?

4 MR. SENOR: No, this is just a picture. That's
5 not mine. That's in the City of San Luis Obispo. I just
6 stole their stencil.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Oh, I'm looking
8 at page 75.

9 MR. SENOR: Yeah, on page 75, the reason why
10 that's in there is because they had that stencil custom made
11 and they were right by our office, so we can get that
12 stencil from them.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Oh, so that's not
14 going to be a stencil on that street, because that street is
15 a regular street that has car traffic on it.

16 MR. SENOR: Yeah, that's a regular car street that
17 they closed off to cars.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You just want to
19 give us a picture of how it's going to look like.

20 MR. SENOR: Right, right. Yeah, I just -- that's
21 just an opportunity that we have, because actually I worked
22 there before and I made the stencil, so I was able to call
23 them up and ask them if I could borrow the stencil, if this
24 happened to work, just because it's nice and big. So, that
25 was all that is.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, have you any
2 thought on what happens when you put a bicycle and the
3 driver approaches, where is he supposed to start if there's
4 no bicycle, does he have to stop, can he intrude into the
5 bike box if there's no bike?

6 MR. SENOR: Well, that would be the compliance
7 part that we're -- yeah, I mean he's supposed to stop, the
8 driver is supposed to stop at the first stop bar, the other
9 place is supposed to be only for bikes. That might be the
10 one part. I mean another one of the options that did come
11 up, I meant to add, was someone in our office requested
12 using Sharros (phonetic), and, you know, we looked into
13 that. The way that the code is written right now at MUTCD
14 is the Sharros can only be used when there's parking, so we
15 weren't able to go with that option. Right now we're not
16 proposing any signs or anything. If you look at Vancouver
17 or Portland, they've actually colored the pavement in the
18 bike box area. Our Deputy District Director, who also is
19 the Deputy District Director for Maintenance, does not
20 really support the signs and the colored pavement. So,
21 we're trying to something here that wouldn't do that.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, I've seen
23 these in Portland. I think I have pictures even of them.

24 MR. SENOR: Okay.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Chief, what's

1 that going to do with the California law, what if the driver
2 intrudes into the bike box, is there any provision that you
3 can cite them for that?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: If they're not in the
5 intersection, so they haven't run the light.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, technically
7 they're not violating any California law, even if they drive
8 into the box.

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I guess, well, they
10 would be, because, you know, right now you can set your stop
11 bar, it doesn't say in the MUTCD the distance that you put
12 your stop bar back. You can set that where you want. So,
13 really, if we get permission for two double stop bars, the
14 legal stop bar would be the one that's back.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: If it's that
16 legal stop bar is the one that's back, then the bicycle
17 cannot cross that either, because then the bicycle is in the
18 intersection.

19 MR. SENOR: Well, that's why I'm asking for a
20 double -- experimental for a double stop bar. It's two
21 separate stop bars, one for a bike and one for a car.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Oh, it's going to
23 be an interesting issue for enforcement. That's the
24 standard -- let's see -- questioning -- any other questions?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I just want to make a

1 comment.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Sure.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: You know, the bicycle
4 community is not 100 percent behind this, this concept.
5 There's some concerns. Some of the people here are going --

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I'm sure they're
7 going to share their comments with us like before when we
8 open it to public. Members of the Committee, Mr. Fisher?

9 MR. SENOR: Before you go on, real quick, there
10 is, in R4-6, it says "Stop here on Red" and it has an arrow,
11 which would work but then actually the bikes would be
12 violating it when they crossed it so, I don't know.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, then the
14 bikes cannot cross that sign either.

15 Mr. Fisher?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Dario, I'd just like to
17 ask you a few questions so I can get it straight in my mind.
18 Is the box, is it a suggestion to motorist not to intrude
19 or is it a violation to intrude, in your mind?

20 MR. SENOR: In my mind it would be a violation.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay.

22 MR. SENOR: But, I don't think it's something we
23 would enforce for the experimental period, because we're
24 trying to check compliance.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay. Second question.

1 Is it mandatory that bicyclist use the box?

2 MR. SENOR: No.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay.

4 MR. SENOR: The Class 2 will still extent up to
5 the front.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay. We are currently
7 required, when we upgrade an intersection, to put in
8 detectors that detect bicyclist as well as motor vehicles at
9 the stop line.

10 MR. SENOR: Right.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: We have a detection zone
12 at the stop line. Would there be any such requirement in
13 the box?

14 MR. SENOR: Yeah, this actually -- the reason this
15 came up is this is Highway 227 and we're doing a full rehab
16 right now.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay.

18 MR. SENOR: So, just last week this just got
19 completely paved, they're actually waiting for this to strip
20 it, but yeah, the detection for bikes has already been added
21 in there. And another thing, just let me add, I forgot to
22 say is, this is the only intersection in our entire district
23 that has this unique situation as far a everybody wanting to
24 do a bike box, or something, and the thing that's unique
25 about this is the free right, the right turn being removed

1 and the shared thru in the left, it's the only intersection
2 in our whole district that has this. So, our caveat, if
3 someone wanted to use it, it would have to meet these
4 standards if we were going to do it elsewhere.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay. So, while the
6 bike box, in your view, would allow someone to use, a
7 bicyclist to use this, the bicyclist could still legally get
8 into the left most lane to turn left, correct?

9 MR. SENOR: Oh sure.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay. And then are you
11 asking for experimentation approval for the Bike Boulevard
12 markings?

13 MR. SENOR: Well, just for the stencil.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay.

15 MR. SENOR: I just wanted to use the bigger
16 stencil. I mean I can use a regular stencil, it's just I
17 think it's too small. The one that's made for a Class 2,
18 you know, it's made to fit into a five foot lane. Since I'm
19 using a whole lane, I kinda wanted the stretched out one.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Here would be my
21 concerns. Sometimes the law gets in the way of good
22 innovation, and I find this bike box to be very intriguing.

23 I think it's very interesting. But right now, unless there
24 is a designated bike lane, bicyclist must obey the rules of
25 the road. In other words, they're vehicles on the roadway.

1 So, there is no separation. I'm not aware of any current
2 Vehicle Code provision that allows priority treatment at the
3 head of the intersection to allow bicyclists to get at the
4 front of the line, not that there shouldn't be, there isn't
5 currently any. And then on the Bike Boulevard thing, it
6 appears that vehicles are allowed to use it, so now we're
7 using the stenciled marking, which looks very similar to
8 this, for a designated bike lane. We've got something a
9 little bit different from this, that's the Sharros marking.

10 And they have distinctive meanings. I think then if we use
11 a pavement marking to indicate a preferential route for
12 bicyclists, we're kind of further diluting the original
13 meaning of the bike lane marking.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's for
15 illustrative purpose only. They're not going to use it on a
16 street that has cars.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So, you aren't
18 requesting approval for this?

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Just for the box.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Just for the box.

21 MR. SENOR: I'm requesting approval for the box
22 and then secondly, if I could use this bigger stencil, but
23 if that's something that you don't like, I would drop that
24 out and use a standard stencil.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: The stencil in the box

1 or the stencil on a Bike Boulevard?

2 MR. SENOR: The stencil that's on the Bike
3 Boulevard. And this bike, it actually is the same
4 situation, because on this Bike Boulevard there's cars
5 allowed, so they're crossing over the stencil all the time.
6 It's just the reason the City stretched it out was so that
7 cars could see it better.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So, the Bike Boulevard
9 is one that you're trying to concentrate bicyclist on but
10 motorists can use?

11 MR. SENOR: Yes. Basically what it is, if you saw
12 the big picture on this, Bike Boulevard, I mean it's not
13 really related to this but, they've put diverters every
14 other block so that cars have to get off but, they're still
15 allowed on the road. And then bikes get to go through the
16 diverters.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay. And then are we
18 intending to seek approval from the FHWA for the experiment,
19 since it would change the FHWA standard?

20 MR. SENOR: Well, Portland already received
21 approval to do a bike box, so I don't actually know how that
22 works. I mean if you tell me I have to do that, I can.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Because often when we
24 want to change the Federal standard, we get their approval
25 for their experimentation process, and then we come to the

1 CTCDC just so we can track what's going on statewide and
2 approve that.

3 MR. SENOR: Yeah, I figured that since Portland
4 already got approved for it, I didn't need to do that, and
5 that's why I came to you, to the CTCDC. But, if that's not
6 the right process then --

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: At times FHWA
8 approves things for other states that California law does
9 not allow, so that is the problem, we are trying to get
10 around it. Comments?

11 MR. SENOR: If there's a problem with the stencil,
12 I can remove that. I guess what I would really be asking
13 for is the double stop bar, that's where, that's the only
14 violation or non-standard thing as far as our MUTCD and our
15 CDC is written. Because, like I said, you are allowed to
16 put the stop bar wherever you want, I'm having a double stop
17 bar, so it's for two uses like Johnny was saying, and I get
18 that. That's what I would be asking to experiment with.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. If you
20 have no other questions, I would like to hear from the
21 public.

22 Any other questions?

23 (No response.)

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Let's open
25 this to the public. Any members of the public who wish to

1 share their thoughts with us? Jim?

2 MR. BAROSS: I'm getting hungry, how about you?

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: We're going to
4 stop after this, then we are going to have a 15 minute lunch
5 break and working lunch, because we have to finish.

6 MR. BAROSS: I'll try to keep this brief but I'm
7 going to speak for two organizations. First, the California
8 Bicycle Advisory Committee, of which I'm Vice Chair, saw
9 this proposal and recommended that it not be pursued.
10 That's first.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And your reasons?

12 MR. BAROSS: Primarily the double stop bar
13 requires a change in the Vehicle Code, providing priority to
14 bicyclists in front of motorists is not standard by
15 anybody's standard in California anyway, much as we would
16 like it, I should state for many bicyclists. It is so far
17 outside the standards, and we think that even though --
18 well, let me start it over.

19 We're very happy that San Luis Obispo came forward
20 to CBAC and is pursuing experimental process. Long Beach
21 didn't. And I think there's somebody here from Long Beach.

22 I have some pictures of the Long Beach example of where it
23 is being used, one of them shows some of the difficulties.
24 And I'll pass those around.

25 It's an appropriate process that these things get

1 vetted and tried out. Experiment is good, innovation is
2 good, but we've got to take this step by step and make sure
3 everybody is safe and understand what's going on. I would
4 -- so that was the major reasons that CBAC didn't approve.

5 And by the way, we were not provided with this
6 issue as an item to make a decision upon, and then provide
7 that recommendation to you. All we did was look at it,
8 decide and show them the problems we saw with it, and we
9 were not -- which I think would have been more appropriate,
10 given us an opportunity to provide to you a recommendation
11 or not.

12 Now I'm going to shift gears. I'm representing
13 the California Association of Bicycling Organizations in
14 that we would like to help them resolve the issue at that
15 intersection, and possibly make resolutions that are
16 appropriate available to other agencies. I think there's a
17 more step by step process available that is less of a jump
18 to trying brand new pavement colorings and things like that.

19 For instance, in the Federal MUTCD, which you're going to
20 be reviewing soon, the expanded use of Sharros, that's a
21 shared lane marking in the lane, is going to be up for you
22 to decide. That expanded use allows its use in certain
23 circumstances where there is no on street parking.
24 Currently it's only available where there is on street
25 parking. So, the Sharros, under the Federal MUTCD could be

1 reviewed or will be reviewed for adoption into the
2 California MUTCD if they went forward with use of Sharros,
3 this is -- with a request for experimentation -- this could
4 be a way for us, you, to better evaluate whether you're
5 going to include the expanded use of Sharros in the
6 California MUTCD.

7 In this particular situation, encouraging
8 bicyclists to use the full lane, in other words to move over
9 into the lane space that's appropriate for them to use when
10 they're going straight through, that's what it's all about.

11
12 The other item that's going to be in -- excuse me
13 -- that is in the Federal MUTCD, which you will be given an
14 opportunity to review, is, as I mentioned earlier, the
15 "Bikes May Use Full Lane." The "Bikes May Use Full Lane"
16 sign in the Federal MUTCD is designed to be used where
17 appropriate, where the lane is too narrow for side by side
18 sharing with motor vehicles and bicyclists. That could be
19 the situation here when and if the lane was narrowed for
20 that outside lane.

21 Right now at CBAC, when we were presented with
22 this, there was some confusion about whether that stripe in
23 this intersection was a bike lane stripe. It's not a bike
24 lane stripe, it's a shoulder stripe. It's providing some
25 confusion for bicyclists because many people look at that

1 stripe and think, oh, well, it's a bike lane stripe, I have
2 to stay to the right of it. If it wasn't appropriate
3 striped bike lane stripe, it would be dropped or dashed
4 before the intersection, encouraging bicyclists and
5 motorists to the merging behavior. That could have been
6 done.

7 So, two items could be used instead of this bike
8 box, that is Sharros, as an experiment, "Bikes May Use Full
9 Lane" as an experiment. And a third one, another example of
10 experimentation that you have approved, at least as I recall
11 you have, in Long Beach they're using the center green
12 stripe, right. Now, that's an experiment that's going on,
13 it could be part of this which also encourages bicyclists to
14 take the appropriate safer space, and also let's motorists
15 know that there's going to likely be the bicyclists there.

16 So, what I'm encouraging is, yes for
17 experimentation, but let's experiment in a step by step
18 process, using things that are going to be coming to us
19 anyway, the Sharros and the "Bikes May Use Full Lane".
20 Thank you.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you very
22 much.

23 Chad?

24 MR. DORINSIDE: Chad Dorinside, Best Highway
25 Safety Practices Institute. On the double stop line,

1 specifically this issue was raised a month ago with the
2 Office of Traffic Operations in Washington DC and there can
3 only be one stop line, period. Arizona was using double
4 stop lines, wait here, additional pavement markings, and
5 they specifically ruled that that's not an approved traffic
6 control device.

7 Number two is, I would be very concerned, on a
8 change interval, a bicyclist moving at slow speed, presuming
9 they have the right of way to go in front of traffic, and
10 having somebody who is not aware of the local practices and
11 having that person pull directly in front of a vehicle
12 that's still stopping, or deciding to go through. I think
13 that the conflict possibilities are very high with that type
14 of interaction going on, and there may be another method to
15 do this but, I don't think this is the answer.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you. Any
17 other members?

18 MR. ROSEMAN: David Roseman, City Traffic
19 Engineer, City of Long Beach. We support this application
20 for experimentation and actually in Long Beach we do have
21 two bike boxes that we've gone through the Federal process
22 for experimentation, and we did bring forward to you at one
23 of the last meetings some of those projects that are
24 ongoing. In this case, I think that the issue of the two
25 stop bars, if you look at the drawing on 73 that was

1 supplied, the bike lane is actually -- does not have a limit
2 line through it, so the bike limit line is the further limit
3 line and the car limit line, the lane adjacent to it, would
4 be the second limit line. That's how my interpretation is
5 or that's the interpretation that we have in Long Beach.

6 Actually, why we would think this is a good
7 experimentation to have is, you're going to have not only
8 information, Caltrans information from San Luis Obispo, you
9 will have reported back to you information from Long Beach
10 on a colored bike box. And I think it's important in the
11 evaluation criteria, which I think is a little short on
12 detail in the explanation, is that if they gather the same
13 type of information that we will gather, you will be able to
14 see the differences between colored pavement and non-colored
15 pavement. Specifically, I think even though they don't have
16 any accidents, they should still track the accident rate,
17 because it's the vehicles that travel over that same
18 marking, not just the bicycles.

19 Secondly, the vehicle violation rates of that
20 first limit line, what is that percentage, how many do
21 encroach into the bike box, how many don't? Part of that
22 will be perception, part of that will be willful violation
23 but, tracking that would be important. Not only peak but
24 non-peak.

25 And then the third item is the percentage of

1 cyclists that actually use the bike box. Some will choose
2 not to, some will choose just to stay to the side and not
3 occupy the center part of that lane. I think that
4 information will be important to compare and contrast with
5 the information that we're gathering in Long Beach.

6 So, that's our position on that. Thank you.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Before you go,
8 can I ask you a question? How would you hold up a ticket in
9 court if the driver moves into the bicycle box?

10 MR. ROSEMAN: We would say that they violated the
11 limit line, they moved into, past the limit line.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: How would you
13 define that that's the limit line when the bicycle can cross
14 it and it's not technically in the intersection?

15 MR. ROSEMAN: No, the bicycle did not cross it.
16 If you look at the drawing that's presented to you --

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, but what
18 I'm looking at is that this one -- if I'm looking at this
19 correctly, the vehicle is supposed to stop here but the
20 bicycle goes to the second one.

21 MR. ROSEMAN: But if you look at the bike lane
22 marking, there is no limit line across the bike lane
23 marking. This is the same approach that we used in Long
24 Beach.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah but it's

1 still -- look at No. 2 lane, in No. 2 lane, bicycles and
2 vehicles must stop at the same stop bar, at the same limit
3 line. That's the California Vehicle Code.

4 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, there are different
5 interpretations of that, however, in this experiment that
6 we're doing through the Federal Government, this is the
7 interpretation that we took. Now, we haven't written any
8 tickets in Long Beach that I'm aware of at this point.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Because I've seen
10 a few of the FHWA approvals, just because FHWA approves, it
11 doesn't mean you can do it in California, because the
12 California law doesn't allow you. So, you need to go change
13 the California law. In this specific case, and I defer to
14 Chief on this, he's our expert on law enforcement, if the
15 bicycle can stop at the line that's right at the first one,
16 I would say, then the vehicle can stop there. If the
17 vehicle must stop at the second one, then the bicycle must
18 stop at the second line also. So, I don't know how you go
19 about that, if I get a ticket and I go to court, the Judge
20 is going to say there's only one stop limit, there's only
21 one limit line for this intersection.

22 MR. ROSEMAN: Well, this is their project. I
23 don't want to take anything away from their project but, you
24 have jagged limit lines at many intersections that are
25 skewed, you will have the number one lane will be ahead, the

1 second lane will be back --

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I understand that
3 completely but, each lane, each lane has one limit line,
4 each lane. I understand the concept of the jagged limit
5 lines, we do it in a lot of places but, there's still each
6 lane, for all vehicles including bicycles and motorcycles
7 and all that --

8 MR. ROSEMAN: Well, we would take the liberal
9 interpretation.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There you go.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: But the thing is,
12 you're not in any position to interpret anything. It's the
13 enforcement that's out there taking, the law enforcement
14 agency that's taking enforcement, and then the court system
15 deciding what they're going to do with that citation. Do
16 you even have any citation data? You haven't written any
17 citations but --

18 MR. ROSEMAN: We haven't written any citations
19 that I'm aware of.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: But you don't write
21 citations. So, have there been any citations written, that
22 would be the question?

23 MR. ROSEMAN: I'm not aware of any citations that
24 have been issued by the City of Long Beach Police Officers
25 for vehicles extending into the bike box.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Any other
2 questions? Mr. Fisher?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yeah, I'd like to ask
4 Dave a question. It won't be a legal question, it will be a
5 safety question. Some distance from the intersection, the
6 bicyclist has to decide do I enter the left slow lane to
7 turn left or do I try to use the bike box, okay. And the
8 bike box might work well if the motorists abide by that
9 second limit line, if they do that, and if the signal is
10 still red when the bicyclist gets there, so that he has time
11 to maneuver in there and position himself. But, supposing
12 the bicyclist makes the decision, no, I'm going to try the
13 bike box, and the signal is red but you start to get close
14 to the intersection and it goes green and the bicyclist
15 wants to turn left. He would have no way of turning left
16 then. He planned on using the bike box, he might enter the
17 bike box during the green and might cause, you know, a
18 collision with a car rear ending him. How would that work?

19 MR. ROSEMAN: Well, in this, again, this is their
20 -- I mean if you want to jump in at anytime --

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You're doing
22 fine, go ahead.

23 MR. ROSEMAN: You know -- do you want to answer
24 it?

25 MR. SENOR: Yeah.

1 MR. ROSEMAN: Okay. Go ahead.

2 MR. SENOR: That's a valid question. I think that
3 would be an unsafe maneuver for them to do, and they could
4 do that anyway. They're allowed to take the lane, they
5 could get over, so if they decided to do that, whether the
6 bike box was there or not, it would be not the smartest
7 thing for them to do anyway. As far as getting over into
8 the number one lane, they wouldn't do that, because the
9 number two lane is also a left turn lane. That's why no one
10 would really do that. I've never -- no one -- I've never
11 ever seen a bicycle get over into the number one, because
12 they don't feel like they need to because they're already in
13 the left turn lane. So, I mean everyone has said that, and
14 we've thought about that. If the light is already green,
15 and they're trying to get into the box, I mean on paper that
16 might happen. I don't see that that would happen because it
17 just doesn't make logical sense out there, that you wouldn't
18 really do that. You wouldn't do it now with the box not
19 being there and I don't think, I would hope you wouldn't do
20 it with the box being there, because it's just an unsafe
21 maneuver.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.

23 MR. SENOR: I want to actually add to what Jim
24 said. The CBAC did not deny this. This was brought to the
25 CBAC as an informational item. Johnny was at the CBAC at

1 the time, he told us about the double stop bar and they
2 requested, or suggested that we come to the CTCDC.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Let me just say, you
5 know, I saw some statistics, I think it was on Portland, and
6 like 62 percent of the people don't use the bike box, they
7 stay in the bike lane.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Sixty percent of
9 the bicyclist do not use.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Bicyclists, don't even
11 get into the box.

12 MR. SENOR: The thing though too, on those
13 Portland ones, this is very unique because of the shared
14 left and thru, if you even just go on Google and look at the
15 bike box pictures, you'll see a lot of them that are not
16 this. I mean this has a free ride and then a shared left,
17 and a thru so, it's different. A lot of times, in the
18 Portland ones, they've just put a bike box at a signal in a
19 thru lane or something. And so that might be true but, I
20 think in this one, the compliance level would be better for
21 bikes too to use it, because they need it, because it's
22 unique.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you.

24 Let's move on. Any other members of the public? Okay,
25 very quickly. Let's finish, okay. Hold on. Deborah,

1 sorry?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: I was just wondering if
3 you tracked the intersection use of the right, do most
4 bicyclist use the right bike lane or do some bicyclist
5 currently take the lane or go into --

6 MR. SENOR: No, I haven't. Have you seen any
7 bikes take the lane? Do you take the lane?

8 MR. FUKUSHIMA: Not very many.

9 MR. SENOR: Yeah, I think they're so worried they
10 just don't do it because they don't -- I mean a lot of
11 people don't even know they can take the lane, is what I
12 think. This is trying to let them know that they can take
13 the lane. I mean another thing I could do is remove the
14 stop bar, the second stop bar and use the crosswalk as that.
15 I mean it's still, in theory, a second stop bar but, you
16 know.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Zabir.

18 MR. ZABIR: Zabir, City of Poway, San Diego. I
19 was going to say, why don't you move the first stop box, so
20 that way the --

21 MR. SENOR: What they're saying though is the bike
22 still can't pass.

23 MR. ZABIR: Right. I understand the bike but, the
24 vehicular would stop at the first limit line, because the
25 other one would be the crosswalk and that's a standard.

1 MR. SENOR: We could enforce it if I did that. If
2 I removed the second stop bar, you could enforce the car but
3 then you wouldn't be enforcing the bikes and I can see where
4 the conflict is.

5 MR. ZABIR: Right. The second, just I notice on
6 page 76, and I think probably John can relate to that, there
7 is a sign that says "Right Turn Only", and then underneath
8 it it says "Bicycle Except", wasn't that plaque discussed at
9 the National Committee meeting and it was not accepted? So,
10 I don't know if this regulatory sign is an actual sign or
11 not.

12 MR. SENOR: This is just -- don't look at that.

13 MR. ZABIR: Okay.

14 MR. SENOR: It's on a city street, I just stole
15 their stencil, that's it.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: This is not a
17 proposal. Okay. Anybody from the public?

18 (No response.)

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Seeing none I
20 close --

21 MR. ROSEMAN: One last thing.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes, very quick.

23 MR. ROSEMAN: I just want to reiterate that you
24 would have information from two types to review, and I think
25 that that would provide valuable information not only for

1 you but for us in evaluating how to work for them.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thanks, I
3 appreciate it, you always have good comments for us.

4 Any other members of the public?

5 (No response.)

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Seeing none, we
7 close the public hearing part of it. We bring it back,
8 okay.

9 My concern with this is that neither this
10 Committee nor the FHWA and the Federal Government is
11 authorized to preempt California law. We can't just approve
12 things just because we think it's a good idea. If you think
13 it's a good idea, you have to go through the appropriate
14 process as we are doing with a lot of other things bicycle
15 related, like we are going to be discussing the 15-81 and so
16 on and so forth. That if you think this is good -- because
17 this is entrapment for the motorists. You can't create a
18 condition, as much as we think it may be a good idea to have
19 two limit lines for the intersection, each lane, I
20 understand and what Dave said, that we have the staggered or
21 jagged limit lines but still each lane, the intersection is
22 defined by one limit line. And all vehicles, bicycle, bus,
23 truck, motorcycles, they have to comply with that. They
24 have to stop behind that. The minute you cross that line,
25 you are in the intersection technically. So, even if you

1 remove the first one, actually the second one, the one
2 farther out, then the bicycle is in violation, the bicycle
3 is entering the intersection on a red. You can't have it
4 both ways.

5 So, that's the problem that I don't know if -- and
6 again, you know, I don't want to speak too much for law
7 enforcement -- how your officers out there are going to
8 interpret who is in violation.

9 MR. SENOR: Can I offer a suggestion on that? I
10 believe the Vehicle Code allows for ten feet of creep,
11 right, once you stop.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: At the signal
13 light?

14 MR. SENOR: At a stop bar. I don't know. That's
15 what I was asking, is that not --

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, no, no, we
17 are issuing \$700 tickets to people who make right turns --
18 no, no, no. The minute you cross the limit line, you're
19 violating.

20 Chief, do you have any thought on this, how if
21 there is any solution even to this, if you want to approve
22 it?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I don't know that there
24 is a solution. You've explained it perfectly with the limit
25 line situation and I don't think we can -- we can't predict

1 what law enforcement officers out there will do. And you're
2 right, we can't just override the Vehicle Code to experiment
3 on something either. So, I don't know, I don't know how
4 this works.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
6 members, comments, thoughts, suggestions? Mr. Henley, this
7 is a Caltrans item, what's Caltrans' legal interpretation?
8 Have your legal people looked at this?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No, they haven't. I'll
10 be the legal person. No, you can't have two limit lines in
11 California right now so, you know, we're basically
12 suggesting we try something illegal for awhile, that's what
13 we're suggesting. I know as a bike rider, I do something
14 like that anyway. If I know I'm going to go left in a
15 situation, I'll stop at the limit line and I'll get right in
16 front of the first car, in front of the limit line, so at
17 least he doesn't get much of a running start on me. But, I
18 think -- I think what the bicycling community wants to do is
19 share the lane. So, what I would almost do is merge, in
20 other words merge that little bike lane right into, you
21 know, somehow with a curb or with a striping or something,
22 put them both in there and say share that right, you know,
23 the number two lane through that intersection. That's what,
24 you know, to me, that gets a better more utilitarian
25 bicyclist solution. But, I hate the spiteful, you know,

1 what you're trying to do is innovative but it's beyond the
2 law.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: I have the same comment.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Ms. Wong?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: I cycle in San Francisco
6 and if I came to an intersection like this and I was going
7 right, I would stay in the right lane but, if I was turning
8 left, I would probably share -- I would share the lane, I
9 don't know if I would maneuver to the front even, I would
10 just sort of, you know, farther back, maneuver into traffic
11 and turn left. And I'm wondering, in your area, if cyclists
12 aren't confident enough or don't know that they can share
13 the lane, because you mentioned that. So maybe, you know, a
14 simple sign to remind, you know, everyone that that's the
15 law.

16 MR. SENOR: Yeah, they could do that. The problem
17 here is it's very high volume, so there's always cars at the
18 light, so it's always -- every time there's a red light,
19 there's a cue, a very long cue, so there isn't anywhere to
20 get in. You could get on the side but now that car is still
21 going to go straight. If you got in front of them, like
22 Wayne was just saying, then you're actually violating the
23 Vehicle Code because you crossed over the limit line. So,
24 that's where I'm kind of in a jam trying to come up with
25 something, you know, because it's right what you said, and

1 they know they can share the lane but, they can't because
2 there's a big cue there all the time.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Well, they don't need to
4 go to the front to get into the cue, they can go in, you
5 know, wherever it starts backing up.

6 MR. SENOR: Yeah, they could.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'll tell you the
8 motivation for getting on the front is to get, you know,
9 before the traffic picks up speed, because if you're back in
10 the cue, you know, you basically are really holding up a lot
11 of traffic.

12 MR. SENOR: That's part of the problem, I think,
13 of maybe why they don't merge in farther back in the cue,
14 because the cue is long and then it's just very
15 uncomfortable to be there because you can't keep up with
16 them as they start going, maybe. I'm not sure but that's
17 probably why.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: If the problem is the
19 cue, I mean I see a possible mitigation measure, and that is
20 to stripe another lane, two lefts and one thru, and you've
21 got the room to do it in your drawing. You've got a big
22 unused space going in the opposite direction, so you could
23 shift the striping over.

24 MR. SENOR: On the other side of the road?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yeah. You've got, you

1 shown lane drop arrows but there's no lane drawn, you've got
2 one lane going through in the opposite direction and you've
3 got all this unused space for only one lane. So, I imagine
4 there would be some way to shift it over and create another
5 lane, at least for a short distance. And I don't know
6 whether that would be enough given your volumes, but --

7 MR. SENOR: Yeah, I believe that that has
8 something to do with the truck turning template from that
9 left turn, because the skew of the intersection, and also
10 the skew, the offset of the driveway but, I see what you're
11 saying.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, okay.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: This also looks like an
14 access management issue. I mean this looks like it's a
15 driveway, right? How many driveways does this piece of
16 property have?

17 MR. SENOR: That's it.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: That's the only driveway
19 they have.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Does that
21 driveway get a lot of access from the thru movement?

22 MR. SENOR: It looks like a little shopping mall
23 thing.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you
25 very much. Yes, do you have a question or you have

1 discussion?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, idea is just remove
3 the two limit lines and have a painted crosswalk, and have
4 the bike box shared with the pedestrian crosswalk. Is that
5 possible?

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: As what
7 Mr. Henley said, you know, you can always go in front of the
8 vehicles and get into the crosswalk but, technically you are
9 breaking the law. You're not supposed to be there. There's
10 only one limit line for bicycle, for cross, for everybody.

11 Anyway, thank you very much, let's bring it back
12 to the Committee and see what we want to do with this.

13 Mr. Henley, it's your application from Caltrans, I
14 asked if Caltrans legal has even looked at it, to see if
15 legally if you guys are going to be liable once you
16 implement this, even on an experimentation, in case there's
17 an accident there. Because you're doing something in clear
18 violation of California Vehicle Code.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: That's right.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Now it's on the
21 record. That's a footnote for the attorney who is doing to
22 use it for the lawsuit.

23 MR. SENOR: I think that for me, that's where the
24 experimental status came in, I was willing, I'm willing to
25 take that on if I had experimental status but --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I mean we can
2 authorize experimentations as long as we are not violating
3 state law.

4 MR. SENOR: Right, right, I understand.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I mean this is much like
6 the Hawk system, remember the Hawk system?

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: We can't violate the
9 law, so we really can't do this experiment as stated, unless
10 we get some kind of change to the law or get a legislator to
11 pass a law.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Because the Hawk
13 is a good experiment, they're using it in other states but,
14 California law doesn't allow the application, even on an
15 experimental basis.

16 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So, you withdraw the
17 item?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: What's that?

19 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So you withdraw --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I guess that's the
21 action that has to take place, we have to withdraw the item.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So you either go
23 for a vote or you withdraw, what do you want to do?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Are you okay with that?

25 MR. SENOR: Yeah, I mean I appreciate your time, I

1 get it.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, we
3 don't need a vote, you withdraw.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: We don't have a vote,
5 we'll just withdraw.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, the
7 applicant withdraws the application.

8 It's one o'clock and we want to get to Item 10-1,
9 which is the a lot of folks here on that item. That item, I
10 anticipate we are going to have some good extended
11 discussion. Do you want to break? Because I think the
12 cafeteria might be closed, bring lunch back here, do a
13 working lunch. Is that what you want to do? If you want
14 to do that, you want to go until what, it takes about 15
15 minutes or 20 minutes?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: 1:30.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, 1:30 is too
18 far. Let's be back here about 1:20, okay.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Well, if everybody
20 is buying lunch, there is one person there.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, go 1:30,
22 1:30 we are going to reconvene but, we are bring lunch back
23 here.

24 (Thereupon, the meeting was recessed,
25 to reconvene at 1:30 p.m.)

A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N

1:30 p.m.

1
2
3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let's call the
4 meeting back to order. Thank you all. And we are now
5 moving to -- we have a few items.

6 Mr. Henley, do you want to do 10-1 or do you want
7 to take care of 10? Do you think 10-05, if 10-05 is not
8 going to take more than te minutes, you want to take 10-05
9 or you just don't want to, you want to wait for 10-05?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Let's --

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's the
12 children present.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Oh, when children are
14 present. Let's get warmed up on 10-01, let's get 10-01
15 first.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Let's
17 start, because the 10-01, we start warming up on 10-01.
18 Okay. This is awhile back when the Assembly Bill 15-81 was
19 approved by the State Legislature and signed by the Governor
20 and became effective California Law. The Department of
21 Transportation was vested with the authority and
22 responsibility to develop the standards for implementation
23 of 15-81. And 15-81 pretty much said that the department
24 has to provide bicycle detection at the new traffic signals
25 or when they do modification to signals, and they had a

1 certain limit that if the modifications are over that dollar
2 amount, or whatever the limit was. And the other component
3 was the timing that there must be adequate timing for
4 bicycles to safely clear the intersection. And both
5 concepts were things that some municipalities, some traffic
6 engineers were doing on their own previously but, now this
7 is like the official state law. It took a little while, it
8 took I think about a good two years, if you guys remember
9 that, it took a couple of years to go through all the
10 different meetings and all that. And finally we are the
11 subcommittee and subcommittee went to CBAC and then here,
12 and the Berkeley folks came and they did their presentation.

13 So, we adopted a set of standards, introduced new standards
14 into California MUTCD, both for detection and for timing.

15 Then after the standards were approved, and the
16 Caltrans Director issued the policy directive, some cities
17 and counties, they started looking at this thing a little
18 bit more closely, which I wish was done when we were going
19 through the discussion but, we don't live in a perfect
20 world, we live with what we have.

21 So, there was a discussion that maybe the timing,
22 as recommended in the standard, as approved by Caltrans,
23 which is the law of the land today, maybe needs some
24 modification to accommodate better signal operation or more
25 optimum signal synchronization programs. And I'm not going

1 to speak for the proponents of that, I'm going to not steal
2 their thunder.

3 So, it was brought back, it was discussed in the
4 last Committee meeting and we said that since it's not on
5 the agenda it's already a done deal, we cannot discuss it.
6 If you want to discuss it, we have to put it on the agenda
7 and bring it back. And there are representatives from the
8 Orange County Transportation Authority, from the Consulting
9 community, and Mr. Knowles has put this item on the agenda.

10 So, Mr. Knowles, why don't you run us through the
11 background and what the issue is and what your suggestions
12 are.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I have a Power
14 Point presentation to help me with that.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I thought you
16 would.

17 (Asides preparing PowerPoint presentation.)

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That's part of the
19 challenge, in terms of how you want me to present this.
20 When we met in December with the Bicycle Advisory Committee,
21 and we talked about the subject for about four hours --

22 (Laughter.)

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- and we started
24 before lunch and ended after lunch, as a matter of fact.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Is it possible

1 that you can do it like 20 minutes, to wrap it up, if
2 possible?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, then that becomes
4 the other issue. It seemed to be easiest to discuss it in
5 pieces rather than running through every single issue before
6 we had any discussion. But, I can take a shot at starting
7 and we can see. There's just so many different pieces to
8 it. The problem that I ran into is that I've been pro
9 bicycle detection for quite some time, even back in
10 Pleasanton we installed about 115 video detection cameras to
11 provide that improved detection for cyclists and
12 motorcycles, along with cars. And since this time, this new
13 policy has been adopted in Vacaville as part of the stimulus
14 package, we did an overlay project, in connection with that
15 we're installing 60 video cameras and, because, per the
16 rules, because we were providing bicycle sensitive
17 detection, then the guidelines say we should be using
18 bicycle signal timings. So, right off the bat I needed to
19 start taking what the policy is that was written and
20 applying it to real world conditions, and ran into some
21 problems.

22 I mean the basic background on this was that, you
23 know, in our initial calculations the implementation of this
24 new section 4D-105-CA will make intersections less
25 efficient, increase fuel consumption, increase automotive

1 emissions, increase greenhouse gas emissions, increase
2 transit head ways, result in unnecessary stops and delays to
3 the motoring public, and reduce traffic safety. So, what
4 I've done, and you'll see in the letter, what I did first
5 was simply provide substitute language for the section, the
6 Federal language was in blue, the California amendment I
7 showed in red, and then my proposed changes and insertions I
8 put in green to try to solve these various problems while
9 maintaining the goal of providing improved bicycle clearance
10 for cyclists. So, I was trying to make everybody happy and
11 of course that's impossible.

12 The things we ran into is, you know, do these
13 guidelines apply to left turn phases, you know, is the last
14 conflicting lane the last thru lane or the last right turn
15 lane? Should the bicyclist's path of travel be measured
16 from the limit line or the end of the detection zone? Can
17 supplemental detection zones be used to shorten the
18 bicyclist's path of travel and conflict exposure time that
19 the W distance, shown in the formulas? How does traffic
20 signal face sequencing effect bicycle conflicts? Again,
21 these are things you don't run into until you actually start
22 to apply the policy. Can the bicyclist's mean speed be used
23 where -- when slower cyclists who travel at the 90th
24 percentile slower speed are not likely to be present?
25 Because the current standard is based on the tenth

1 percentile slowest speed, and I don't know of any case in
2 traffic engineering where we use the tenth percentile speed
3 instead of something closer to the critical speed, or at
4 least the posted speed limit or the average speed but the
5 tenth seems very severe. And then how should traffic
6 engineers balance the traffic signal timing guidelines in
7 this section against all the negative impacts this would
8 have in other sections of the MUTCD that says green time
9 should be proportional to volumes. And there are all those
10 kinds of things that seem to conflict with this, since
11 bicycle traffic represents about two percent of the traffic
12 on the road, and yet to accommodate two percent of traffic,
13 we're expected to increase minimum green times by up to 200
14 percent. And what kind of discretion do traffic engineers
15 have in setting the signal timing, based on all these
16 factors and the new language in this particular section.

17 Let's see how this works here. We're going to be
18 challenged all the way through, I have a feeling. Yes.

19 So, the good news was, after meeting for four
20 hours, we actually came to -- I can push different buttons
21 and see how the display changes -- that doesn't do anything.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: You need to go back.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That one, how about
24 that. And then this one?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yes.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: How about that.

2 So, we did meet with the Bicycle Advisory
3 Committee, and there were several things we actually agreed
4 on, and then there were some areas that I considered
5 additional changes to be necessary. And this is the five
6 bullet points that summarize what was agreed to at that
7 meeting, in terms of bringing a recommendation forward to
8 this committee. And what I want to do is, take these points
9 bullet by bullet, they all represent -- the four of them
10 represent changes to the existing language, recommended
11 changes from the California Bicycle Advisory Committee to
12 the existing language as it was recommended by our Committee
13 and also per the directive issued finally by Caltrans.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, you prefer to
15 go over every single bullet, stop, have a discussion, move
16 to the second one. Is that what you're saying?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Maybe the most
18 productive, we can start with this one, for example, this
19 one was the easiest.

20 Here it was simply the case that right now W is
21 the distance crossing the intersection, is measured from the
22 limit line to the last conflicting lane, wherever that is.
23 And the proposal I made to the Committee is, using existing
24 technology, and more testing is involved but, according to
25 my manufactures, using existing technology, I can use my

1 video to setup a detection zone within the intersection,
2 this red sone here. So, right now, in this diagram, you can
3 see where the cyclist is and we're measuring the distance W
4 all the way from that cyclist until the clear the farthest
5 lane. And we'll discuss some particulars of that.

6 What I'm proposing is, I can use video to set up a
7 detection, supplemental detection zone, which I've shown as
8 that red block, within the intersection. And because my
9 video camera is wired to the controller, that detection zone
10 is only active during the green of that phase. It's not --
11 so I don't have to worry about it being tripped by any cross
12 traffic, any opposing left turn movements that crossover
13 that. It only comes on during the green. That way, if I
14 have a bicycle or a slow accelerating truck -- I used to
15 work in Pleasanton where we had a lot of full quarry trucks
16 -- some vehicles are slow to accelerate, that way my W
17 distance is now measured from the end of the detection zone
18 to wherever we say that bicycle has finally cleared traffic.

19 And it was a way that if it's a car, five second minimum
20 green, they're going to clear that detection zone based on
21 normal perception reaction time and acceleration, a bicycle
22 is going to need more time.

23 So, this would actually be a change within the
24 language that was adopted to measure from the end of the
25 referenced bicycle detection zone, rather than measuring

1 everything from the limit line. And so what I did, in my
2 letter on page three of 43, was simply insert that first
3 green line, "Supplemental detection zones, new technology or
4 various signal controller settings may be utilized to reduce
5 the time a bicyclist is exposed to conflicting vehicle
6 traffic." So, this would have the effect of reducing the W
7 in the formula. And this was something the Committee agreed
8 with, based on this bullet point. That if there's
9 technology that can distinguish a car from a bicycle, and if
10 the technology can provide these supplemental detection
11 zones, they did not have a problem with that changing how we
12 measured the distance W.

13 So, I don't know whether you want to cover
14 everything or talk about that?

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let's do it this
16 way, I don't to keep opening and closing public hearings.
17 Let's do your --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- bullets at one
20 time. And then if members of the Committee have questions
21 about the bullets, or they have concerns, make your
22 questions and comments on that bullet, so that we move onto
23 the second bullet. Members of the public, please take notes
24 on every single bullet and then I will give you time to get
25 up here and you say, by the way, on that point one, this is

1 what our concerns are, this is what our issues. Otherwise
2 we have to go back and forth between and it makes it very --
3 less productive, I should say, in terms of time.

4 On this specific bullet, in case there is a
5 reliable, whatever that means, in case there is a reliable
6 technology that can identify a vehicle or a bicycle in the
7 intersection, in that detection zone, can the W be reduced
8 rather than the full length be from the start point to the
9 end or the beginning of the detection zone?

10 Jacob?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: One thing is, does the
12 member have -- do you have copies of this slide?

13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I sent to you separate
14 model.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Not of this particular
16 slide. What I tried to do, instead of coming back with the
17 46 slides that we used at the Bicycle Committee, was to take
18 the feedback from the Committee, tried to refine what the
19 issues were and just kind of stick to what the outstanding
20 issues were. And where we kind of came to agreement, come
21 up with a display that best kind of described what we're
22 talking about in the supplemental detection zone.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Kind of on page
24 22 of his letter, of his initial letter, the concept is kind
25 of shown in color, if you want to look at that.

1 Okay.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: The one point I have to
3 point out with regards to this concept is that I got a call
4 from one city saying they were having a problem picking up
5 the reference bicyclists with video detection, and my big
6 concern, since none of this timing has ever been tested,
7 even though it's now the statewide standard, I'm now
8 concerned, until I do my test, that a 90 pound cyclist on a
9 small bicycle with 16 inch rims, with no iron in it, it
10 might not even work. So, we need to be careful, there may
11 be an issue to come back on with regards to the reference
12 bicyclist, if we can really demonstrate that the detection
13 doesn't pick up what we've proposed as the design cyclists
14 in this case. It was the first I'd heard that, since I've
15 been using video, I've never gotten a call from a bicyclist
16 or a motorcyclist, where I'm using video, so I thought it
17 was a non-issue but, there may be an issue.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, bullet
19 number one, still we don't know even if the technology is
20 going to allow us to do that.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, it would apply to
22 all video and the smallest cyclist on a small bicycle.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Questions?
24 Okay, Mr. Fisher?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yeah, just really a

1 comment. In your green language on page three you say, "may
2 be utilized to reduce the time." I think what you need to
3 do is put that section in with the formula that has the time
4 formula width, so that we're associated that statement with
5 the formula, to reduce the time below whatever the formula
6 says.

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: That is -- oh, the
8 other items, yes.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So, just to comment that
10 I think that option probably should go further --

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Under the guidance?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: -- down the stream. No,
13 it can still be an option.

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah but --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: But I think it needs to
16 be associated with the formula. When you say reduce the
17 time, reduce the time compared to what?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes. And that's part
19 of the difficulty here. The letter that I submitted to the
20 Committee was before the meeting with the Bicycle Advisory
21 Committee, and I haven't gone back and rewritten everything
22 based on that. So, this is an example of proposed language
23 that could help but, you know, it's not --

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Jim, I saw
25 Jim raising his hand, as the Vice Chair -- hold on -- let's

1 go through these bullets and if you can kind of pick up the
2 pace, we'll cover it and then we come back, and then please
3 come here and we will give you time and you go through every
4 single item but, please make notes.

5 Go ahead.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I think that based on
7 this slide, I think in reference to what John just
8 mentioned, the lower section of this green text is actually
9 proposed for the option to the bicycle timing, where the
10 supplemental reference bicycle detection zone new
11 technology, and actually reference the formula there. So,
12 that, I believe, is in the green text under options. It's
13 the third to the last sentence, I believe, yes. The third
14 to the last sentence in the options section, where we're
15 talking about timing. Because remember, everything up above
16 was dealing with detection, and it was only once we got down
17 to options -- or was it -- yeah -- it was only later where
18 we were providing that, that we got into timing. So, I had
19 to adjust the language both in the detection section and the
20 timing section. But, I did include that.

21 So, the second bullet in the memo had to do with
22 where is the conflict point? When we use language that says
23 that we have to provide enough clearance to clear the last
24 conflicting lane, what is that conflict point? And in many
25 ways we came to some agreement but, there's the main point

1 of contention remains, I think the left turn lane, if you
2 have a right turn only lane, do you include that when you're
3 measuring this distance? And I have a couple examples.

4 So, the standard -- and we don't have a pointer
5 here -- do we have -- I don't know if the laser -- the front
6 button, okay. The typical diagram everybody sees is this
7 one, you have a bicycle coming straight through the
8 intersection, you have a T-bone example and that's W, is
9 this conflict. The problem is, at a major intersection this
10 is almost never the conflict. Almost always -- not almost
11 always but most often this thru movement is followed by the
12 leading left turn movement, and you usually have opposing
13 leading lefts. So, actually, this is a fairly rare
14 occurrence at a major intersection. Typically -- so instead
15 of measuring this distance to clear this conflict, it's more
16 realistic to measure this distance for this conflict. And
17 that makes a huge difference in terms of what that minimum
18 green time is.

19 Similarly with this left turn movement, that is a
20 legitimate conflict but, what happens when you have a
21 lagging left? So, when we get into actual signal timing,
22 depending on the coordination on the street, the signal
23 phase sequence, this was another area we agreed that
24 defining the last conflicting lane is really the last
25 conflict in the following phase most likely to come up in

1 the traffic signal sequence. And so this would not just be
2 a carte blanche, this is always W since most often this is
3 the conflict. The only time this would be the conflict is
4 when you had a leading left on this side and a lagging left
5 on this side, so that northbound proceeded immediately after
6 this thru movement.

7 Then the other question is the right turn movement. I f
8 you have to clear the last conflicting lane, theoretically
9 it's not this thru movement, it's this right turn movement.
10 And by the time you've cleared this point, you know, so it's
11 this conflict point way out here, to clear the last
12 conflicting lane, according to Webster's and not this point
13 here. Now, what the Bicycle Committee recommended was, they
14 said, you don't need to go past the prolongation of the curb
15 face. And my point simply is, if a right turn -- if this
16 was a right turn only lane, so it's a right turn only, it's
17 not a shared lane, it's not a thru ride, and the right
18 turner can turn right on red anytime they think it's clear
19 to do so, it makes no sense to extend their red time for the
20 sake of this bicyclist, when no matter how long you make the
21 red they can turn right on red. So, you really haven't
22 gained anything other than increasing delay for everybody,
23 because you included the right turn lane. So, this is a
24 point of contention.

25 There was agreement that engineers should have

1 discretion to look at the phase sequencing when determining
2 what the conflicting lane is for the purpose of measuring W.

3 But, we did not agree on should you include right turn
4 lanes or not, right turn only lanes. The Bicyclist
5 Committee position was you have to include the right turn
6 only lane but, you don't have to measure beyond the
7 prolongation of the curb face. My recommendation strongly
8 is looking at the data, you should exclude right turn only
9 lanes because in almost every case a right turn may be made
10 on red, and extending the red time does not add anymore
11 production to the cyclist, plus it's a low speed movement,
12 typically ten miles an hour or less.

13 And the other recommendation I was making in the
14 text was, where you have a very wide curbside lane, you
15 should only measure the conflict point about ten feet off of
16 the lane line, because if this -- like in Vacaville, one of
17 our typical 20 foot curbside lanes, there's no reason to
18 measure it all the way to the curb face when the thru
19 traffic is going to be, this trailing edge of the thru
20 traffic is going to be about ten feet off of this lane line.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, on that one
22 very quickly, so the point of disagreement was the exclusion
23 of the right turn only lane.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Correct.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And then the half

1 lane. But, in terms of real practical field experience, if
2 you're using 15 feet per second, how much difference does it
3 really make in real life if you include that ten foot or
4 not?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, it helped to come
6 up with language that said you don't have to go past the
7 curb face. But, in --

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, I'm talking
9 about when the lane --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right, well, I mean
11 that reduced the distance but, you know, in many cities, you
12 know, I use the slide of this intersection in Dublin, Dublin
13 Boulevard at Tassajara Boulevard, they've got a series of
14 double rights. So, it's actually a lot wider than you think
15 when you've got a bike lane and then a double, you know,
16 it's two or three seconds difference.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Question John?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, since we're doing
19 this one subject at a time, I think the intent was to
20 identify the worst case scenario, and that's why, you know,
21 the worst case scenario could be a two phase intersection
22 where the bicyclist proceeds and then the traffic on the
23 cross street gets their green. And in that case that would
24 be the worst case scenario. You have to clear the whole
25 roadway. But, in your case, where you've got a fully

1 actuated intersection and you've got protected phasing, I
2 imagine you could have a situation at 1:00 in the morning
3 where you don't have opposing lefts, so you have a leading
4 left turn, but your thru movement is going at the same time,
5 in which case there would be a conflict between the
6 bicyclist getting through the intersection and traffic being
7 released, thru traffic being released on the cross street.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes. So that the
9 language in the Caltrans memo said, when depending on phase
10 sequencing and demand for the movement at different lanes
11 such as the left turn on the cross street is the last
12 conflicting lane, clearance need only be provided for those
13 cyclists to clear that lane. But, this was totally an issue
14 of engineer's discretion. Again, it goes back to is this
15 fixed, is the policy going to be no matter what the phasing
16 sequence, this is what you measure to or, if I'm doing
17 minimum recall, you know, whatever, can I -- remember what
18 we're dealing with is possibly at two o'clock in the morning
19 when there's one car present, extending this green time
20 here, which means the red time here, by, you know, five to
21 ten seconds, and then multiplying that all the way around
22 the intersection. It's not just the one phase that we're
23 increasing the red time for.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: But is that --
25 I'm trying to understand the actual real life application

1 and ramification of this. If you're talking two o'clock in
2 the morning, who cares what your signal timing is? There's
3 not really a whole lot of traffic out there. Is that really
4 -- I'm trying to --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, but, okay, okay,
6 let's talk about 10:00 a.m. At 10:00 a.m. when the morning
7 peak is over, the noon hour hasn't started, we're not in the
8 evening peak, we're running coordination on an arterial
9 roadway, you still have a significant amount of fuel being
10 consumed, automotive emissions, transit lines are still
11 running, all those are being impacted by going to longer
12 cycle lanes.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, I'm just
14 trying to understand the actual ramification of these
15 abstract things.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. Well, first it
17 really comes to the concept of, is there a downside to
18 longer red times? And once you have some concurrence that
19 more stops, more delays, longer cyclings have negative
20 ramifications, then it's a question of, what can you do to
21 provide the clearance for the cyclist and minimize stops and
22 delays in cycling. So, if there's no agreement that there's
23 some benefit to minimizing the impact, then it's pretty much
24 the end of the discussion. We're looking for ways to try to
25 minimize the impact but still provide the clearance for the

1 next conflicting phase.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: But the language does
3 say "to the last conflicting lane."

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right, but it wasn't
5 clear what --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, no, but you can't
7 make it clear for a thousand different cases in options of
8 timing. So, if you determine that at all times of the day,
9 24/7, the last conflicting lane would be those left turn
10 lanes and not the companion thru lanes, because of the way
11 you phase it, I think you could legitimately say you've
12 timed it to the last conflicting lane. But, if there's any
13 possibility that it's going to be that right turn lane that
14 gets a green ball, that follows the bicyclist going through,
15 then you might say that's your last conflicting lane. But,
16 I think the language allows you to determine it without
17 defining it so precisely that we're not dealing with the
18 hundred different situations.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And that's why we don't
20 want to provide, you know, 40 different iterations of the
21 potential phase sequencing, just make reference to the fact
22 that phase sequencing can be taken into consideration.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It's not only
24 phase sequencing, you're showing an intersection that has
25 four equal width legs. If the east/west corridor, here in

1 this diagram, is significantly narrower than the
2 north/south, still the thru movement is going to be your
3 critical conflict. Still that distance is going to be
4 longer than the left turn. Because the east/west is going
5 to be half the width, which happens a lot, which is --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I tried to simply it
7 using this diagram. What I presented the Bicycle Committee
8 was all overlay on aerial photographs but, you know, that --

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Well --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- you know, maybe that
11 was my mistake here. It seemed better to use aerial photos
12 of the real world, just so we could discuss your point,
13 rather than these generic diagrams. But, right now, the
14 only example that we have in previous, you know, the Devices
15 Committee staff reports all showed this very standard
16 conflict, and there's no language to show that there's any
17 discretion to define the last conflicting phase as anything
18 other than this movement. I mean you have to think about
19 the average engineer that hasn't been involved with any of
20 these discussions and how he's going to interpret the
21 language in that manual when it comes down to, you know,
22 what is my last conflicting phase, you know, movement. And
23 this is what comes to everybody's mind.

24 So, that was just my recommendation as one
25 individual.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Any other
2 questions on this bullet number two?

3 (No response.)

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Moving on.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So, this was just a
6 slide showing that there's different conflict points
7 depending on the phase sequence. And in this example,
8 instead of this being the conflict point, most likely I'm
9 going to be leading this left, so actually I would be
10 measuring W from my detection area to this point, and in
11 fact this distance might be so short I don't even need
12 supplemental detection, if all I need to do is measure to
13 this point instead of way over here.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well does that depend on
15 the type of phasing you have?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: If you have a protected
18 phase, I imagine you'd want to time it somewhere near where
19 the bicyclist leaves the limit line, plus or minus a few
20 feet. If you're talking a permissive phase, the bicyclist
21 can get out almost to the middle of the intersection and
22 seek a gap.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So, we've got all these
25 different combinations and permutations.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: As I read it, if you
2 read the language right now with regards to signal timing
3 based on this bicycle data, it doesn't talk about the
4 engineer having much flexibility at all. You simply measure
5 W, apply the formula or really go to the table and you're
6 done. There's no engineering. And so we had this
7 discussion about what are the different things engineers can
8 look at when they're trying to apply this policy that's
9 brand new and has never been tested anywhere in the state.
10 So, you know, there are -- but I'm faced with either
11 implementing this right now, because I'm installing the
12 detection, or not. Then so I need to get some
13 clarification. And if I was in the discussion and had
14 confusion about what I'm allowed to do, imagine engineers
15 that are hearing about this for the first time.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Mr. Chairman?

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Question. All of this,
19 in particular the first slide, is that the concerns of you
20 or with regard to the capacity or the safety?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, safety is a
22 separate issue. We brought up the fact that anytime --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Excuse me -- if it's a
24 separate issue, then the main issue is capacity.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No, well --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: -- because it's timing,
2 I mean timing is what? It's capacity of the level of
3 service at the intersection. Right?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I see it as two
5 separate issues. We know that the longer the red is on on
6 the main street, which has the higher volume, the greater
7 the chance of collisions, especially due to rear ends, and
8 the higher the frustration level, the more red light running
9 there's going to be with unreasonably long reds. Also, ITE
10 says that the longer the cycle lengths, the greater the
11 change pedestrians will not wait for the walk, and so you
12 get more pedestrian violations the longer the cycling. So,
13 this jeopardizes both pedestrian safety, per ITE, and also
14 just standard collision rates based on increased numbers of
15 stops and delay on the main street.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: So, it's safety, it's
17 not capacity?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It's both. It's both
19 capacity. It is greenhouse gas emission and it is traffic
20 safety. You're lengthening the cycle lengths decreased
21 pedestrian safety, that's per ITE, that's right in the ITE
22 manual on signal timing.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But the first slide you
24 showed was the bicyclist crossing the intersection versus
25 the right turns.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Correct.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: All right. If you have
3 a safety issue, just don't allow the turning on red.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That has greenhouse gas
5 issues. The idea is to let that person go and not keeping
6 him idling at the intersection when it's clear and he can
7 turn right on red.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, did we define
9 that, what is that? How much is that increasing, not
10 allowing right on red?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: When you take that to
12 all four corners, you might be talking close to ten seconds
13 per cycle, just for that one movement, that decision.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: With respect to the
15 pollution?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No, with respect to
17 increased delay and increased stops.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: The timing. Unless if
19 you have heaving turning, right turns, right?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It's a right turn, I'm
21 assuming there's a --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: -- under normal
23 circumstances you don't have heavy right turns.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- decent right -- this
25 is going to drive him crazy with regards to taking minutes.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let me say
2 something. This is my half hour checkpoint.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Half hour already?

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah. We have
5 spent a half hour, we have not finished your first two
6 bullets. What I would like to suggest is that we do not
7 interrupt you. Go ahead, very quickly, finish your
8 presentation, tell us all the five bullets and then we come
9 back, because this way we are going to be only covering his
10 presentation until 3:00.

11 Go ahead.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: This is probably the
13 most contentious issue, I think, or maybe bullet number
14 three, I'd have to check, it's the design speed. The design
15 speed used in this formula assumes the tenth percentile
16 slowest bicycle and although the Legislature said we were to
17 use standard, you know, traffic engineering principles in
18 designing the timing, somehow we adopted timing based on the
19 tenth percentile slowest bicycle. And in looking at the
20 data, this information comes from our own staff report. It
21 was interesting to find that the San Francisco bicycle plan
22 assumes 12 to 15 miles an hour for bicycles when setting
23 signal timing along bicycle routes, and that even in the
24 study that was conducted for us, it found that the tenth
25 percentile crossing speed was 10.7 miles an hour, or 15.7

1 feet per second. And for some reason we rounded that down
2 to ten miles an hour, and 14.7 feet per second instead of
3 the 15.7 per second that's actually the tenth percentile.
4 So, actually the speed being used in the calculations is
5 lower than the tenth percentile, because according to our
6 staff report the tenth percentile is the second feet per
7 second faster and seven/tenths faster, and that's the tenth
8 percentile.

9 So, it was also interesting, in the signal
10 clearance timing for bicyclist in the ITE article, back from
11 1995, that their study showed that the mean bicycle speeds
12 for a fast cyclist is 18 miles an hour, for the casual adult
13 cyclist is 12 miles an hour, and then nine miles an hour for
14 children, and yet we set all of the timing 24 hours a day,
15 seven days a week based on ten miles an hour, which doesn't
16 seem consistent with what San Francisco was doing or with
17 what this data showed.

18 So, the red section, the top of this table is
19 actually from the new table, Table 4D-109-CA, and then the
20 information at the bottom was from six bicycle studies done
21 in Palo Alto. And what I found interesting in using this
22 information is, you notice the top intersection it says
23 "Camino Real at Embarcadero is 130 feet wide", and it says,
24 "The mean crossing time was 10.2 seconds." So, if you go up
25 to this diagram and you look at 130 feet, we're using 15.3

1 seconds. So, my argument is that the mean speed is much
2 more realistic than below the tenth percentile speed that
3 this chart is based on, and at almost every single example,
4 if we're trying to minimize the cycling but still clear the
5 average or the majority of cyclists, you can see that the
6 values in Table 4D-109 consistently exceed the actual study
7 measured crossing times in this data. And this isn't data
8 -- right now I'm forgetting whether I pulled this out of --
9 I think I pulled this out of our, you know, the
10 subcommittee's staff report in terms of it's very hard to
11 find bicycle data but, here's an example where they studied
12 bicycles and consistently the mean crossing speed was much
13 faster than what we're currently telling every city that
14 they were recommending that they use in the guidelines.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That table is in the '95
16 ITE --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It was the '95?

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- THE '95 ITE.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So, it's out of the '95
20 ITE paper. Thank you.

21 So, that's why I bring up this particular issue.
22 When we're calculating the green time, right now, even
23 though staff found that the tenth percentile was 15.7
24 seconds, the calculation right now is based on 14.7 seconds.
25 And I just wanted to contrast that with what San Francisco

1 is using, which was up to 22 feet per second, and then the
2 ITE articles, mean traffic speed for children, for casual
3 adults and for "fast cyclists", whatever they are.

4 But, my point is that when you look at our large
5 intersections, and you take a look at this movement, for
6 example, who would most likely drive, ride across these two
7 right turn lanes, these three thru lanes, get in the double
8 right turn lane, and then make this left turn movement?
9 Right now we're assuming an elementary school child does
10 that. That's the speed that we're using. You know, what
11 I'm suggesting is that we really should be using the 18
12 miles per hour speed from the study for left turn movements,
13 because it's really going to be your faster aggressive rider
14 that's going to use a left turn phase like this, rather than
15 the slowest tenth percentile rider on the road.

16 And so that's why you'll see, in this
17 presentation, what I'm recommending now, based on the review
18 of the data, is to use the 18 mile an hour speed for the
19 left turn, because typically that's our longest exposure
20 time, cycle lengths are being driven more by this left turn
21 movement, even than the thru, so to use the fastest most
22 aggressive speed on this document, and then use the mean
23 speed not the tenth percentile speed for less, use the
24 casual adult speed of 12 miles an hour for the thru and then
25 where we have the slower bicyclists routinely present, use

1 the child speed of something close to ten miles an hour. We
2 have very similar standards in the MUTCD right now, where
3 typically, and I know the standard is changing, we have been
4 historically using four feet per second as pedestrian
5 clearance time, where we had senior centers and documented
6 slower pedestrians, we would use a slower crossing speed.
7 Same goes for the walk time, you know, seven seconds of walk
8 time but, you could document reasons to take the walk all
9 the way down to four seconds, you know, under unusual
10 conditions. And so what I'm suggesting is, typically your
11 aggressive rider at a higher speed is in your left, your
12 casual adult is in your thrus, and then the exception would
13 be near elementary schools, near entertainment cites that
14 might draw younger --

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I think we got it

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: You got it.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Do you want to
18 move to the other?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Somehow we got where we
20 are, I'm concerned that we don't get it.

21 The other -- we have to go back to that bullet
22 point to see -- in an effort to speed this up -- what -- I
23 think we just had -- yes. So, the one thing the Committee
24 did agree to was there is a shortcoming of data, so when you
25 look at the bullet point that was actually in the Caltrans

1 manual, where local agencies could get local data, they did
2 recommend there be more discretion, instead of using this
3 blanket tenth percentile speed, you know, the recommendation
4 was clearance time for bicycle's left turns may be adjusted
5 depending on local experience and engineering judgment,
6 provided that the tenth percentile bicyclist is still
7 accommodated. But, they agreed that -- nobody has ever
8 studied, well, to date, maybe we'll see some new data, the
9 speed of the left turn bicycle. And my contention was our
10 slowest tenth percentile bicyclists are not the ones using
11 left turn phasing at wide intersections. So, the Committee
12 agreed that for local agencies that had the data on their
13 local left turn speeds, you could, you know, adjust the
14 speed assumed in that formula.

15 And so I provided two slides, this is the
16 distances based on 12 miles an hour, which I'm assuming for
17 the casual adult going through the intersections. I bumped
18 it up to 15 miles an hour for those making the left turns.
19 This is still below the aggressive fast cyclist, but it
20 conformed to that 12 to 15 mile an hour range that San
21 Francisco was documented as using. And then went so far as
22 to say, and under unusual conditions where the slower
23 elementary school students are routinely present, go to the
24 ten mile an hour values. So, it had three different tiers,
25 again trying to provide realistic clearance times but

1 minimizing the impact to the traffic signal operations. And
2 I provided language to that effect within the green text.

3 I'm trying to move it along. And I do want to
4 comment on your previous comments with regards to what was
5 actually in the legislation. This is actually the chapter
6 bill, and I think it's very important to continue to note
7 that even the Legislature recommended that we do this in
8 conformance with professional engineering practices. So,
9 again, I question the tenth percentile. And also, the only
10 time they referred to signal timing was right here where it
11 says "and related timing". There was nothing that said
12 bicycle clearance time, W, you know, high speed, elementary
13 school, slow tenth percentile, it was just used professional
14 judgment in creating other related timing. So, we have that
15 discretion that -- the Legislature I talked to -- a
16 Senator's office that was on the Housing and Transportation
17 Committee, and a staffer for the Committee, and they said
18 they really didn't spend much time talking about traffic
19 signal timing at all. The discussion was about detection,
20 and they left it to the professionals to come up with what
21 the related timing was. But, there was no expectation about
22 what exactly that was going to be.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Can we move to
24 bullet number four and five please?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Let's see. On this

1 one, this issue involves should the travel time of the
2 vehicles -- basically if there's going to be a collision
3 between a cyclist and a motor vehicle, the moving speed of
4 both vehicles are involved. And the recommendation some of
5 us have been making is to again cut down on the cycle length
6 and still provide realistic and effective clearance time.
7 You need to take into account not only that W distance of the
8 cyclist but also how long does it take for the motorist to
9 get from the stop bar to the conflict point.

10 So, in this slide, what I'm showing is the various
11 conflicts. Here you have a left turn movement and there's
12 no question it takes a period of time to get from this stop
13 bar to this conflict point. It takes a period of time to
14 get from this stop bar to this conflict point, this point to
15 here, it's not instantaneous. You can't hit the limit line
16 at the speed limit and have expected to stop in time for the
17 red that was standing the moment it turned green. So, what
18 I've done is used the standard formulas out of Synchro, in
19 terms of acceleration time, to calculate how long it takes
20 to get to these conflict points, and subtracting that from
21 the bicyclist time.

22 Now, that was a concept. Whether we just wanted
23 to say, you know, for ease of calculations make it a second,
24 make it two seconds, so that you don't have to worry about
25 exactly all the possible combinations but, in our mind, my

1 mind, and the engineers from Orange County that are involved
2 with this, there's definitely some time component taken up
3 by a car to get to the conflict point. So, that should be
4 deducted from the calculation of exactly how much clearance
5 time is necessary for the cyclist. Again, if you use this
6 diagram, and I know this came up before, and this is also a
7 picture of an arterial and a narrower collector, in case we
8 want to get into the discussion of what happens in this
9 instance but, we had this discussion before.

10 If you look at the typical conflict of a
11 pedestrian in the crosswalk, and the fact that the line
12 between the pedestrian and the motor vehicle is that 12 inch
13 line, so the distance at the -- the concept was, we should
14 completely clear the bicyclists because, you know, we've
15 faced this issue before with pedestrians, and we know we
16 lost that battle, the pedestrians were adamant that we need
17 to get the pedestrian all the way to the curb face and not
18 just to the six feet from the curb face or the middle of the
19 last conflicting lane. But, in this case you can see that a
20 pedestrian crossing the street is in a very different
21 position than a bicyclist. A motorist has to travel much
22 farther to run into the cyclist than to run into the
23 pedestrian that's standing right there. They've got to
24 travel all the way out to this distance. So, I don't know
25 that the argument really stands that because we took the

1 pedestrian all the way past the last conflicting lane, that
2 we have to do that in the case of the cyclist, when the
3 cyclist is so far removed from the approaching car.

4 And the other point that was in the original ITE
5 article on clearance is, one of the reasons why they wanted
6 this clearance interval is because a typical cyclist, which
7 going from this bike lane to this bike lane, it could be
8 blocked, the view of that cyclist could be blocked by -- so
9 if there's a stopped car here and somebody is here, and they
10 want to go straight, they might not see the fact that a late
11 cyclist has entered on yellow or on a stale green, because
12 this car blocks their sight distance. But, this goes to the
13 issue of should we include the left turn movements in this
14 whole discussion. When you're following this blue path of
15 travel, you're passing through the center of the
16 intersection. In no case will anybody block your view of
17 the fact that there's a cyclist in the intersection. So,
18 the argument in the ITE pedestrian article about bicycle,
19 ITE article on bicycle clearance times, that this is really
20 needed because cars are going to conflict, block the view of
21 other motorists of a late cyclist, does not apply when
22 dealing with left turn movements. And again, left turn
23 movements, because this distance of travel is so much longer
24 than this distance of travel, and this conflict typically is
25 this point as opposed to a thru car, which is this left turn

1 movement, it is critical to take a look at thrus and left
2 turn movements separately, in terms of the amount of
3 clearance time necessary to clear somebody all the way
4 across the road.

5 So, basically, as you've seen in that memo, I
6 proposed a matrix that basically had vehicle travel times in
7 a column, and the bicycle travel times in a row, and then it
8 simply did the math of calculating the bicycle travel time
9 minus the vehicle travel time and came up with values in
10 this type of format. And now, if we're going to use ten
11 miles an hour, 12 miles an hour, and 15 miles an hour, of
12 course you'd have to have three separate tables but, that
13 was the concept that I found most workable, if we wanted to
14 provide engineers with a table of exactly what these would
15 be. And then it's just a matter of, as I said, refining the
16 vehicle travel times, whether you really want to calculate
17 or just use a two second standard but, there should be some
18 relationship between vehicle travel time and the cars.

19 And the last slide, the last issue was, while
20 we're trying to decide these matters, should the timing stay
21 in effect or should we have a moratorium on signal timing
22 based on bicyclists. The Committee feels that definitely
23 the standard, as it was adopted by this committee, should
24 stay in effect until a better system is arrived at, whereas
25 in some of our opinions, because of the increased greenhouse

1 gas emissions, the increased fuel consumption, the increased
2 transit head ways, the increased stops and delays, the
3 reduced traffic and pedestrian safety, limited bicycle time
4 samples in any studies, the fact that there's no bicycle
5 left turn data, there's no vehicle, conflicting vehicle
6 travel time data, and there's no implementation test
7 history, this hasn't been tried anywhere else before it
8 became the state standard, we should have a moratorium on
9 implementing and requiring cities to implement this timing
10 until more research is done.

11 And that's my last slide.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you very
13 much. We wrapped it in about 45, that's good. Thank you.

14 Okay. Now, basically there is Item No. 5, bullet
15 number five is really not a recommendation for changes, a
16 recommendation for policy implementation. Very briefly, the
17 suggestion is to reduce the W as it is mentioned in the
18 standard today, if there's reliable detection system out
19 there, to have a detection zone in the intersection to
20 identify vehicle, I mean the bicycle. Clearly defining or
21 better defining the definition of the last conflict, and
22 maybe developing what the alternatives are of different
23 scenarios.

24 The biggest point is Item No. 3, bullet No. 3,
25 change in design of the, in the design speed, or I should

1 say the travel speed of the bicycle, and allowing for
2 different bicycle speeds under different conditions, like in
3 the left turn being different, using a different company
4 speed, and the thru movement and so on and so forth, which
5 will require additional data. And then start accommodating
6 something for a vehicle start up time, which doesn't allow
7 now, a second or two, whatever that may be.

8 And then the last item is to put -- to recommend
9 to Caltrans to issue a moratorium to the local agencies not
10 to use the adopted timing standards of the 15-81
11 implementation until new standards have been looked at.

12 Did I capture it correct?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Much, yes.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.

15 So, we have these five items. Do you want to have some
16 discussion now or we have some people who have been very
17 patiently sitting for a very long time, to hear from their
18 perspective also, and then bring it back. What is your
19 pleasure?

20 Okay. With that, let me say, let me just a quick
21 show of hand so we can manage time better. Who are the
22 people in the audience who want to support Mr. Knowles'
23 proposal? We have three people, four people in the
24 audience. Who are the people in the audience that want to
25 -- I shouldn't say even oppose -- who have concerns about

1 this and they have different views? Good, we have four to
2 four, perfect. So, we have time, so maybe the best way we
3 do it, rather than back and forth, let's hear from people
4 who are supporting Mr. Knowles, and please do not repeat al
5 the stuff that he said, we heard that already. If you have
6 additional information or you want to clarify what he said.

7 We'll start with Ron Keith. Ron, do you want to
8 go?

9 MR. KEITH: I have a Power Point.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. How long
11 is it going to take?

12 MR. KEITH: Not very long.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Who is
14 going to run your Power Point? Oh, Jeff is back there.

15 Okay. Let's just start with five minutes, each
16 member, and if you have more time, we're going to come back.

17 Let's see if you can wrap it up in five minutes, Ron, I'd
18 appreciate it.

19 MR. KEITH: Okay. First of all, I'm Ron Keith,
20 I'm the principal Traffic Engineer of the Orange County
21 Transportation Authority. By the way, we support bicycle
22 detection and AB-15-81 in regard to bicycle detection. In
23 fact, back in the seventies I was one of the first people
24 that helped bicyclists along by inventing external logic to
25 actually time external minimum greens for the bicyclists, in

1 the City of Irvine. And Conrad will attest to that, because
2 he was there as the City Traffic Engineer at that time.

3 Basically, Orange County Transportation Authority
4 is in agreement with Mr. Knowles', most of Mr. Knowles'
5 arguments. One of the things that has not been addressed is
6 what the Committee and others have not even looked at yet,
7 and one of the things that is not in my slide presentation
8 right now, which was not included in looking at the table
9 was, there was never any mention of grade at the
10 intersection in the development of the timing. There was
11 never any information as to offset distance and cyclists'
12 vision of the approaching traffic and vice versa, the
13 opposing traffic vision of the cyclist. There was never any
14 mention of the crown of the road through the intersection,
15 how that might affect the timing. All those things were not
16 addressed in the actual development of the timing table.
17 And there's a lot of things that were not addressed in the
18 whole scheme of things, and basically to get to something
19 that I heard in the restroom during one of the breaks was,
20 what are we going to do about this, everybody is right. And
21 that's correct. Everybody is right. We all have our
22 agendas and we all want to be safe, and we all have to get,
23 you know, make sure that we create the most possible safe
24 but effective operation of our systems, and we have to come
25 to hopefully some kind of an operational compromise that

1 will allow the traffic engineers to effectively move the
2 traffic safely and efficiently through our systems, while,
3 you know, not adversely affecting 98 percent of the vehicles
4 that are traveling through the intersections, and for a
5 possibility that there might be a bicyclist there every
6 cycle. And that's where the bone of contention really comes
7 in.

8 So, I'm going to go ahead with my presentation and
9 tell you what we did not address so far. And here's an
10 indication of what we did not address so far, and this is
11 not an intersection in Orange County, this is an
12 intersection in San Bernardino County, U.S. 395 and Mojave
13 Road. And it's a high desert highway between San Bernardino
14 and the Sierra Nevada, there's no pedestrians. So, the
15 nearest signalized intersection to it is two miles away.
16 There may be one bicyclist ever so often, and some long
17 distance cycle groups come through there. And the data that
18 we're looking at was taken from a recent traffic report
19 using Synchro and the measures of effectiveness output
20 comparing the existing timing to what would happen if we
21 implemented a bike minimum timing out there in the middle of
22 nowhere, where there's no cyclists.

23 And here's what we came up with. The additional
24 annual loss and delay was 1750 hours, stops was an
25 additional 51,500, miles per hour of course was reduced by

1 one mile an hour. An additional 1400 gallons of fuel,
2 etcetera. You can read the rest of it, the (indiscernible)
3 HCM delay was three percent. So, you can see that the
4 impact over an annual basis does start to become
5 significant.

6 So, I don't think that the impacts to operation of
7 a traffic signal or a traffic signal system should be
8 considered trivial by the impact of this directive.

9 One of the things that was not addressed, which
10 Orange County Transportation Authority is very concerned
11 with, is transit. There's no mass transit impact addressed
12 by this thing. Apparently, you know, we want to become safe
13 and we want to get people to use mass transit, we want them
14 to use the busses, we want them to use bicycles, we want
15 them to use all modes of travel, and we want to save time,
16 and we want to move the most people efficiently, and we want
17 to increase the use of mass transit. But, when we put in
18 these timings, it affects mass transit with regards to
19 scheduling and head ways and possible impact to the public
20 in general, because they can't make their schedules,
21 etcetera, we have to redo everything.

22 So, here's a given, we already said this, that the
23 bike green timing is going to increase vehicle delays,
24 number of stops, fuel comparisons and everything. The
25 magnitude of the impact on all transportation modes is based

1 on the traffic volumes. And here's Harbor Boulevard, we
2 looked at four intersections around Disneyland, from Disney
3 Way south to Orangewood Avenue, and we looked at what would
4 happen. And everybody knows that during the peak hours, as
5 was stated before in some of the discussions, actually the
6 timing is not affected very much at all, right? Because
7 there's so much traffic, the bicyclists are going to be able
8 to go through on the existing time, there's no problem.
9 What the problem is is the off peak, and that's where we
10 generate a lot of the increased delays, the stops, the fuel
11 consumption, emissions and everything else. So, here's what
12 we looked at. And down at the bottom you can see that in
13 the example, when we run the peak, that we have about a one
14 percent decrease in overall stop but, when we run the off
15 peak it was over about six percent.

16 And here we go, Harbor Boulevard again, on a daily
17 basis the overall MOEs, including stops, fuel consumption,
18 and emissions increased about three percent overall. A
19 comparison of the bike green times again, minimum green
20 times that were existing on a per intersection per day
21 basis, was about 56 hours per day, 1700 stops, an additional
22 50 gallons of fuel, and a carbon monoxide of 3.5 kilograms.

23
24 There are two thousand signalized intersections on
25 the Orange County signal synchronized network. Those

1 intersections are primary, major or principal, or above in
2 category. We don't look at the secondaries. Actually,
3 there's about 3200 to 3500 signalized intersections in
4 Orange County.

5 Two thousand intersections, if you multiply all of
6 that stuff out and you finally come up with the what's going
7 to happen 365 days a year, you're going to see an additional
8 36.5 million gallons of fuel consumed, an additional 2500
9 tons of increased emissions per year, and it's going to cost
10 the public about 109.5 million dollars.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Ron, could you
12 summarize please?

13 MR. KEITH: Yeah. Here's bus Route 57, we looked
14 at it very quickly, there's 176 daily trips, 60 signalized
15 intersections, average weekday delay is 125 hours. If you
16 multiply that times 42 routes, times 94 trips and an average
17 of 50 intersections, you get 2800 annual hours of delay.
18 What does that equate to? You can read this, I can hardly
19 read it anymore with my glasses but, the annual rider delay
20 basically it comes down to about 1.1 million dollars. And
21 that was all based on all of the averages of going ahead and
22 seeing all those things down at the bottom, you can see the
23 in fact model was used, which is basically what everybody
24 else in the state uses to determine all the different things
25 we are.

1 Scheduling for us is paramount. Riders must take
2 connections to work, to home and other modes of travel, to
3 maintain their personal schedules. The delays in the
4 transit vehicle arrivals will cause one or the other or
5 both, rearrangement in personal schedules, which could
6 result in loss of jobs or delays and all other kinds of
7 things, or we have to increase the number of mass transit
8 vehicles on the route, which means we'll have even more
9 vehicle pollution caused by the busses being on the road, as
10 we said below.

11 You multiply these results by the number of bus
12 systems and bus routes in the entire state, and the thing
13 becomes just a huge number. And we haven't looked at light
14 rail, and another thing that I don't have in my slides is
15 transit signal priority where we actually adjusted signal
16 timing based on busses being late or early. And if we have
17 this other timing being in there, we have to throw that into
18 the mix and we're impacting all of these different things
19 that people in the legislature want to make things happen
20 together. And I think that we have to come up with a --
21 looking at what Jeff has told you about, looking at a better
22 target vehicle for the timing versus a ten percentile
23 person, who probably shouldn't be out in the roadway in the
24 first place.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, could you

1 wrap it up, I have to move on.

2 MR. KEITH: Yeah. So, here it is, OCT interprets
3 the intention of AB-15-81 to detect bicycles but not to
4 remove the engineering judgment and best practices from the
5 decision making process of when and how and where to apply
6 the related signal timings. We think that the
7 interpretation didn't address all the things I've said
8 before, and we request that the Legislature be fully
9 explored with it's actual intent of the wording of related
10 signal timings, and that with the portion of the timing be
11 re-suspended until, as Jeff suggested, pilot projects and
12 case studies of how this is going to impact the system are
13 done. That's done with every traffic control device, every
14 measure, any time we've ever done anything. And in this
15 case it was not. We think that the case studies and the
16 pilot projects need to be done before we implement this very
17 big impact. That's it.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you. Thank
19 you very much. Thank you. Conrad?

20 MR. CONRAD: You can use my five minutes.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.
22 Chalap? Thank you very much, that was a good presentation.
23 By the way, regardless of your views about the whole issue,
24 Jeff's presentation was extremely well done from an
25 engineering point of view. A lot of time spent on preparing

1 those diagrams, I can tell you that. Thank you.

2 MR. SADAM: My name is Chalap Sadam, I'm the
3 Traffic Consultant with (Indiscernible) and Associates. I
4 just want to bring a couple of points, which Jeff wanted to
5 touch, is the use of ten percent now, I think that is the
6 one that's adding more time. So, definitely we need to take
7 a look at the design, bicyclists should be (indiscernible)
8 we normally use for the vehicles 80th percentile, before
9 with 90th percentile on this one. And the guidelines don't
10 necessarily look into how to impact that (indiscernible)
11 left turn phasing, so it needs to be touched into that.

12 And also, do we really need to clear the
13 bicyclists all the way across? No. Every little thing that
14 we're looking at, whatever we use, ten month power to 12 to
15 15, a second here, two seconds here, basically the
16 cumulative they add up to maybe three, four seconds. What
17 we're talking about is typically the main times like now we
18 have is maybe five seconds or six seconds, but the new
19 guidelines we're probably going to 12 to 14 seconds. If you
20 can just shave off a couple of seconds, maybe instead of
21 going from six to 12, we would go to six to eight or nine,
22 that is not a huge problem. It's just a matter of we agree
23 with the policies of what we have, it's just a matter of
24 tweaking the numbers a little bit so the impact is not too
25 much. That's all.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. I worked
2 with Chalap for a long, long time, and he's probably one of
3 the best signal timing experts in California.

4 In your opinion, from the four issues that
5 Mr. Knowles brought up, which one is the most critical time
6 that's going to optimize that if the committee is going to
7 decide to focus on something, is that W, is that the last
8 conflict, is that the tenth percentile, or the vehicle
9 travel time, or a combination?

10 MR. SADAM: Each of the elements give a second, a
11 second and a half, so depending on which you use, W would
12 clearly define how much it is. If you can (indiscernible)
13 you can shave off a second there. And if you use the speed
14 a little bit more, you can shave off a second. So, I think
15 it's a matter of how you look at it, and each of the
16 settlements add, so it needs to look at the combination.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.
18 Question, Jacob?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Cal Grover was one of
20 the consultants that Chalap works for, they did the -- a
21 value wide signal coordination in the County of San
22 Bernardino for all the cities and counties. And they did
23 the Pier 1 and Pier 2, how many of those sections that were
24 involved?

25 MR. SADAM: Six hundred fifty signals.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. Now, having done
2 that, and you were the lead, I remember that, okay, and you
3 did a very good job, excellent job you did for Sandbag. And
4 all these five bullets here discuss, brought by Jeff
5 Knowles, if you had the choice to implement them, or have
6 you implement those or if you have to implement them, what
7 would be the phase and the capacity and safety?

8 MR. SADAM: Well, the biggest impact happens
9 during the off peak, because many locations do the peak
10 hour, and as has been done by Pat and others, during the
11 peak hour there's adequate traffic. So, giving additional
12 main time doesn't matter, because you're going to give them
13 more time anyway. So, where you have bigger intersections
14 and you have cross streets, hardly any traffic there, now
15 you have to give more time for the cross street because how
16 much the main time needs to be. Basically you shave off the
17 capacity, because you give more time where it's not needed
18 from a vehicular point of view.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Thank you.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I hear you.
21 Okay, thank you. Do we have followup? Sir?

22 MR. MONROY: I'd like to make --

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Sure, yeah, your
24 turn.

25 MR. MONROY: Hello. My name is Edgar Monroy and

1 although I work for the City of San Diego now, I'm not
2 speaking as really representing anything for the City
3 itself. But I do have over 30 years of experience in
4 traffic engineering and right now I retired but I came back
5 to work because I love signal timing. And that's all I do
6 now, 40 hours a week, I do signal timing for the City of San
7 Diego. And one thing that I've noticed, I've been out in
8 the field, you were talking about the safety issues, well,
9 let me stop right there and let me give you a little of bona
10 fides, because it seems like we have this "us" and "them"
11 situation.

12 I used to commute in Santa Barbara, and I actually
13 took away travel lanes from streets, the Bath Castillo
14 Couplet, to put in a missing link for the Cabrillo Bike
15 Path, and I still have this little bag that I would put on
16 the rack on my bicycle, so that I could put my papers in
17 there. So, I was actually, you know, this is back in the
18 eighties, doing bicycle commuting where it was feasible.
19 Now I live out in the foothills so I can't commute, it's 30
20 miles.

21 But, I've been out in the streets and what I've
22 observed is when people don't get good signal timing, they
23 become violators. Right here on Mission Center Road, it was
24 bad timing, I was out there standing on the corner watching
25 the cars go by and I saw several times that the three last

1 cars in a platoon would run the red, consistently, this was
2 about five or six cycles, that people would just run the
3 red. It was a result of bad timing. So, you're creating a
4 very unsafe situation, because people don't want to stop and
5 wait the two seconds -- excuse me -- the two minutes, 150
6 cycles that were running, or whatever is out there. When
7 you have very long cycles, people don't want to stop and
8 wait. And so it's a safety issue really when you have bad
9 timing.

10 The other thing that I've found out, since I've
11 been with the City of San Diego, is that a lot of the -- and
12 this is backing up what Ron was talking about -- a lot of
13 the intersections don't even have detection. The detection
14 is bad. So, what do the techs do? They put it on recall.

15 So, you're talking 7/24, 365 days a week (sic) that you've
16 got a minimum recall. And if you've got to do it with a
17 bicycle timing, people are sitting around looking at you,
18 looking at each other and saying, why are we stopped here?
19 Why is it that it takes so long? It's because we've got
20 these recalls. And the 1500 intersections more or less, in
21 the City of San Diego, more than 1500, 300 of them have been
22 identified, and that was, you know, as of six months ago,
23 they had bad loops. Now, with weather like this and the
24 budget woes that we're going through, those loops don't get
25 replaced. So, you've got all these intersections with bad

1 loops. They don't have detection, they're on recall. It
2 just really messes up your timing.

3 So, it's not just a congestion issue or a capacity
4 issue, it's also a safety issue when people have to wait.
5 And so that's my input on it. Thanks.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you very
7 much, we appreciate it. Dave?

8 MR. ROSEMAN: You asked if you were for it or
9 against it, I found myself in the middle.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, you're
11 running for the Mayor in Long Beach now.

12 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, I'm running for Mayor now.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. ROSEMAN: Dave Roseman, City Traffic Engineer
15 for the City of Long Beach. I just wanted to give the
16 Committee kind of an insight to how the subcommittee viewed
17 a lot of this stuff, because we argued for hours over the
18 language that you ultimately received. And one of the key
19 things that we talked about, and we talked a lot about
20 detection, was how to make it simple, because the key is, if
21 you want something to go throughout the entire state, to be
22 adopted by maintenance crews, adopted by engineers, it has
23 to be something that's easy to understand and easy to
24 maintain. And that's why a lot of the discussion that you
25 see in the detection side tried to be technology

1 independent, these types of things. When it came to the
2 signal timing, that's why that first action, you asked for a
3 table, because let's try to make it as simple as possible.
4 And that's, I found myself looking at the discussions that
5 have come since it was adopted, and I find them very
6 intriguing. The stuff that Jeff brought up is very valid
7 points. Ron spoke very well about the issues of impacts,
8 things that were not really considered in that discussion of
9 the subcommittee.

10 And I feel that we need to balance those technical
11 issues with some type of way to make it simplified so that
12 it can be implemented statewide effectively. I'd hate to
13 have something in the MUTCD that is more technical than
14 anything else we have in the document. It not only makes it
15 difficult to implement but sets it up for all of us as, you
16 know, users of that document, to open ourselves up for
17 lawsuits. What is the conflict? What point is the
18 conflict? Does it apply to lefts? Does it not apply to
19 lefts? And hearing that, you know, from the subcommittee,
20 if we had the benefit of these types of discussions that
21 Jeff has brought forward, I think we would have had a
22 different discussion. Because our goal was to
23 implementation of the 15-81, which was an idea, a simplified
24 idea. How do we take care of bicyclists? Not only detect
25 them, but safely get them across the street in a simplified

1 fashion. And that's what you've got forward and that's what
2 you acted on.

3 So, I don't know if a moratorium is the right
4 thing or not but, I do think a second look makes sense. And
5 I don't think the guys that sat on the committee, and
6 hearing all those arguments, would be supportive of massive
7 tables and whole series of things to review, but to try to
8 bring that all down to something that does make sense. And
9 it seems as if, in the existing language, we have left out
10 some details such as left turns, such as, you know, the
11 various things that Jeff has brought forward.

12 So, I bring that forward, not to say stick with it
13 or go to a moratorium but, that perspective of all of the
14 arguments and discussions that went on for hours on the
15 phone in that subcommittee. These things that have been
16 brought forward were not discussed at that time.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thanks
18 Dave.

19 MR. KEITH: Can I say one more thing?

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let me go to the
21 people who have been waiting. Is it something very quick?

22 MR. KEITH: Very quick.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thirty second
24 type quick?

25 MR. KEITH: Thirty seconds.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

2 MR. KEITH: With regard to what Dave just said
3 about massive tables and everything else, it reminded me of
4 a thought I had earlier, a month ago or so. That I believe
5 that this, along with every other traffic control device
6 that is implemented, that involves a traffic signal or an
7 intersection control system, perhaps not just a timing table
8 should be implemented but perhaps -- maybe I'm throwing more
9 into this than what needs to be in there but -- perhaps a
10 warning system is and should be developed to determine when
11 and how and where, and how we do these things. We do this
12 for when we install traffic signals, when we install cross
13 walks, when we install any kind of a traffic control device
14 involving people that are going to be using a facility,
15 there's a warning system. And I think that's something that
16 we should look at.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.
18 Point taken.

19 Okay, let's go, between Steve and (Indiscernible),
20 which one, do you want to start addressing like the
21 technical issues or you want to go tell us what CBAC thought
22 about it? Which one? How do you prefer to handle your
23 expressing your views?

24 MR. SHLADOVER: I get to choose?

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It's your choice.

1 MR. SHLADOVER: I can present CBAC's approach and
2 some other organizations (inaudible, not near mic). I think
3 the technical issues --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, let's go with
5 Steve. Steve go ahead and cover the technical parts.

6 MR. SHLADOVER: Okay. I have a Power Point we
7 need to pull up.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Oh sure, of
9 course. Who's running that? Okay, you have that already.

10 MR. SHLADOVER: I'm Steve Shladover from the U.C.
11 Berkeley Institute of Transportation Studies. I briefed the
12 Committee a couple of years ago on some of the earlier
13 phases of our work on collecting data, about the times that
14 bicyclists needed to get across intersections. Since that
15 time we've collected additional data on more intersections,
16 and we have some more data collections scheduled within the
17 next couple of months. So, this is very timely in terms of
18 that. And this addresses some of those questions about what
19 kind of speeds are bicyclists really bicycling at, and how
20 much time does it take for them to start up when they're
21 entering an intersection. That has important implications
22 for the formulas that you use to try to select the timing.

23 We've got data now at four intersections, we have
24 the -- okay, it's here -- oh, we need to go to slide show
25 mode. Yeah, if you show us. Okay, thank you.

1 We've measured four different intersections with
2 diverse characteristics and I'll show the data from those
3 and what that data means. And then since we got access to
4 the formula that Jeff Knowles put together, we actually
5 overlayed that on the data from all of these intersections,
6 so you can see the relationship of the actual bicycle
7 crossing times with what's in those formulas.

8 So, the first site was Palo Alto. This was right
9 at one of the entrances to the Stanford Campus where we had
10 a lot of vigorous young adults, pretty fast bicyclists,
11 evening commute, they were in a hurry to get home. We did
12 address crown here, this intersection has a pretty strong
13 crown and that did have an affect on the results. This was
14 also the widest of our intersections in the data collection.

15 We had 111 standing start samples, that is
16 starting up with the signal change, and 70 people rolling
17 through. In Berkeley we did Russell at Telegraph, this is a
18 bike boulevard, it's a residential area with a very diverse
19 mix of bicyclists, mid-size intersection, relatively slow
20 crossing speed. I should mention El Camino was posted at 40
21 miles per hour, and a lot of traffic going 50 miles an hour,
22 it's very fast. This one has grades on the approaches,
23 which affects things. And you see at the bottom, we have a
24 number of standing starts and rolling starts that we
25 collected.

1 San Francisco, we did Sutter at Polk, this was a
2 grade, 4.5 percent grade on the approaches to this
3 intersection, but the intersection itself is flat. The
4 cross street here is Sutter, is one way, and the bicyclists
5 here have very good visibility of that approaching traffic,
6 a lot of them jump the signal. A lot of them do not respond
7 to the signal. In fact, 60 percent of the standing starts
8 we observed here didn't wait for the green. So, we could
9 only analyze the ones that waited for the green, and then
10 we'll show the data on those.

11 In Davis, we were in a residential area where we
12 had a lot of college student bicyclists, morning and evening
13 commutes at the same intersection, large number of data
14 points. And we actually found a difference in the same
15 intersection with the same population, just whether they
16 were going to work in the morning or going home in the
17 evening.

18 That's a summary of the characteristics of those
19 different intersections. We will be collecting at least
20 another four or five intersections in the next couple of
21 months, to try to fill out a range of characteristics, and
22 several of those will be in Southern California as well as
23 Northern California. So, we will be statewide. Because of
24 the time, I'm not going to go into all the details of thee
25 contrasts but, just explain how we analyzed the data.

1 We have video tracking of the trajectory of every
2 bicyclist through the intersection, and this is just an
3 example of a typical trace. That's the start up, the
4 acceleration, and then cruising through the intersection.
5 We summarized these by the slope at the end, which
6 represents the speed, and then we defined this offset time
7 for the startup. It's not just the time from the green to
8 when they start moving, but it's this composite. So, we get
9 down to two parameters. And by the way, this three seconds
10 before they start moving, is not unusual, that's pretty
11 typical, not one second. And we'll go into the data now.

12 This is all synchronized with the signal, because
13 we have the signal data. This first graph is the speed of
14 bicyclists who do not stop at the intersection, they're
15 rolling through. And this is from a variety of
16 intersections. Here you see the speed scale, 50th
17 percentile, we have two downhill intersections, our 50th
18 percentile at one of them you see here was a little bit
19 above 15 miles per hour, the other one is actually in the 13
20 miles per hour range, with our vigorous young adults at
21 Stanford they were around 14 miles per hour. But, if we're
22 trying to accommodate the 80th percentile, which means 20th
23 percentile on speed, those speeds are a lot lower.

24 The uphill ones are these two lowest speed
25 characteristics you see. If we have a positive grade, now

1 we're down in the eight miles per hour or so for the 80th
2 percentile. So, grade does have an important influence and
3 we can see it on this data.

4 And by the way, if you don't like these
5 percentiles, you can choose any other percentile. The data
6 shows everything. So, if you want to use the 30th
7 percentile, or the 70th, you can pull it right off the data
8 plot.

9 Now, the start up times. When you've got a
10 standing start and bicycles have to start up after the onset
11 of the green, virtually nobody is starting within one
12 second, very few within two seconds. And our median, 50th
13 percentile, even at the fastest intersections, is almost
14 four seconds, three to four seconds. El Camino, the one in
15 Palo Alto, was an outlier. Here we are close to six
16 seconds. That's because it's a very wide street with very
17 fast cross traffic. And every one of those bicyclists had to
18 wait to verify that there was no red light runner coming
19 through along El Camino who is going to kill them. So, the
20 bicyclists had to wait a significant time before they'd even
21 start moving to get across that intersection. But, again,
22 if we want to accommodate say 80th percentile, or 85th
23 percentile, we're up in this range, four seconds to say six
24 seconds.

25 Now, the final speeds. When the bicyclists have

1 gotten to the other side of the intersection, they've
2 reached a constant cruising speed across the intersection.
3 These are not the same as the speeds when they're not
4 stopping at all. And again, you can see most, again, we're
5 50th percentile, they're almost all less than ten miles per
6 hour. Again, except for El Camino, which was the widest
7 one, and we discovered El Camino was an outlier once again,
8 because of the width of the intersection, and the crown,
9 when they get past the midpoint of that intersection,
10 they're going downhill on the far side of the crown, then
11 they speed up.

12 We just re-analyzed the data, we took out the
13 second half of the El Camino data, we just took them up to
14 the midpoint of the crossing, and then it fell in line with
15 all the rest of them. Once again, if we want to accommodate
16 most of the bicyclists, we've got to be looking at something
17 like the ten or 20th percentile in those speeds. These are
18 not ten miles per hour, even at the fastest of those
19 intersections, it's nine miles per hour for the 80th
20 percentile.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Steve, so how do you
22 explain what ITE is saying about 18 miles and all that?

23 MR. SHLADOVER: The 18 miles per hour, you're
24 talking competitive racers, you're not talking about
25 typical --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Even like with
2 the 12, even the 12 is not supported by your data.

3 MR. SHLADOVER: Twelve, well, you can -- if we go
4 back to the rolling starts, okay, we do have some that are
5 faster. I think the thing that's important is this data is
6 much more accurate, much higher fidelity than anything
7 that's been collected in the past. That ITE data from 15
8 years ago was done with people standing at the curbside with
9 stopwatches trying to estimate how long it took for people
10 to get across those streets. This is based on detailed
11 video tracking of every bicyclist. And our analyst sits
12 there and plays it back and marks when do the bicyclists
13 enter the intersection, when do the bicyclists leave the
14 intersection. We don't know of any other data set that is
15 even remotely like this for detail, in terms of bicycle
16 crossing time.

17 So, if we try to look at the 90th, the 80th and
18 the 50th percentile, those four locations, these would be
19 the start up offset times. These would be the final speeds
20 when they're starting up from the standing start. And if
21 you wanted to think about clearance intervals, you'd look at
22 a constant rolling speed for the ones who were rolling
23 through on a stale green, then we're looking at speeds like
24 this. Notice, even the 50th percentiles, we only have one
25 of them that's 14 miles per hour, 15 miles per hour is not

1 even on the radar screen here. And ten miles per hour or
2 less, you know, maybe.

3 Key findings. The intersection's physical
4 characteristics and the signal characteristics, the
5 bicyclist demographics and the trip characteristics of those
6 bicyclists affect the crossing speeds. Typically the
7 commuters who are on the commute trips are faster than the
8 ones who are not during commute times. These aggregate
9 numbers for cruising speeds do not represent what happens
10 with standing start crossings from a green onset. The real
11 start up times are longer than the theoretical values,
12 because bicyclists need to wait there to verify that the
13 cross traffic isn't coming, they have to accelerate up
14 crowns, etcetera. It's very much influenced by the cross
15 traffic speed, the density of the cross traffic and the
16 visibility that the bicyclists have of that crossing
17 traffic. All that affects how long they need to get started
18 up.

19 And we also noticed, in our two urban sites that
20 we've done so far, San Francisco and Berkeley, there were a
21 lot of start ups prior to the green. As soon as a bicyclist
22 could see the signal was going to change, they got a yellow
23 on the cross street, nobody is there, they're going.

24 We put this into formulas, based on 80th
25 percentiles and 90th percentiles, as a function of widths,

1 because we have samples at discrete street widths, we wanted
2 to see what would a formula look like if you applied it to a
3 range of widths. And this is --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Could you go back
5 to the formula?

6 MR. SHLADOVER: Yeah, okay.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I want to read
8 the whole thing.

9 MR. SHLADOVER: Okay. So, that's number of
10 seconds and --

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: The W is the W
12 that's defined today in the MUTCD, right?

13 MR. SHLADOVER: In our case it was the W
14 representing the width from when the front of the bicycle
15 entered the first conflict lane, to when the back of the
16 bicycle left the last conflict lane.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Left, okay.

18 MR. SHLADOVER: And again, you could change that,
19 if you wanted to, apply something different based on the
20 previous discussion. And then the W would be the width of
21 the intersection, yeah, that W in feet. And it varies some,
22 depending on which of those four intersections we would use
23 as the basis. But, when we plot them, they start clustering
24 not too badly.

25 So, the Stanford or Palo Alto intersection was the

1 widest, the Berkeley was less wide, and the Davis and San
2 Francisco intersections were very similar. Just this
3 morning I over-plotted the values from the Table 4D-109 in
4 the Caltrans Directive on top of this. And I believe that
5 was aiming at the 85th percentile, because it's pretty much
6 between the 80 percentile and the 90 percentile numbers that
7 we have here.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, that dash
9 line is for the 4D-109.

10 MR. SHLADOVER: Yes, that's the one that's in the
11 Caltrans Directive right now.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: When you say 85th
13 percentile, do you really mean 15th percentile? Because
14 we're looking at the slow bicyclists, right?

15 MR. SHLADOVER: We're, that's right, we're looking
16 at the slow bicyclists. We're trying to accommodate 85
17 percent of the bicyclists, so that that's, when I said 85th,
18 yeah, I meant accommodating 85 percent of them. To
19 accommodate 90 percent of them, then we'd get up to some of
20 these higher ones.

21 The dots here represent which intersection was the
22 basis for the curb. So, for example, this line here was
23 based on the Stanford data, this purple one here was based
24 on the Berkeley data. This was the Davis data point that
25 was showing that. So, the bicyclists in Davis in that case

1 was the slowest of the bicyclists we had here, so that's why
2 that slope is higher.

3 But, anyway, if you just look at this, that
4 Caltrans Directive is not bad for meeting the needs of this
5 part of the bicycling population.

6 Now, the proposal from Vacaville and OCTA, we
7 already had the discussion on the two different sets of
8 parameters for adult bicyclists and for the younger
9 bicyclists, which would be optional, with those times and
10 speeds. And when we put them into an equation, we come up
11 with curves that look like this. These are in meters,
12 sorry, not feet. We normally work in meters and we didn't
13 convert this one to feet. But, here's the time and this
14 would be the acceleration up to the ten miles -- I'm sorry
15 -- the 15 mile per hour speed or up to the ten mile per hour
16 speed.

17 We superimposed those on all the data samples that
18 we got. So, here we go to the Stanford data, Park Boulevard
19 crossing El Camino, this red line, this double red line
20 representing the front and the back of the bicycle, that's
21 the six foot bicycle lane is the gap between those two
22 lines. The organ is the slower one for the young bicyclist.

23 Notice, even the young bicyclist criterion still leaves all
24 of these bicyclists not able to get across within this
25 combined green plus yellow plus all the red interval. And

1 these are the trajectories of the bicyclists who are
2 actually crossing there, see how diverse they are, they're
3 all over the place.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Do you have an
5 estimate on the red, on the adult bicyclists, the red, what
6 percentage of the bicyclists in your sample would be not
7 accommodated by that?

8 MR. SHLADOVER: I haven't done that yet.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: From the density
10 it looks more than 50 percent but I don't want to guess.

11 MR. SHLADOVER: It's probably in the range of 15
12 percent that we're not accommodating. It's a little bit
13 hard to interpret from this because some of those plots
14 where it gets denser are overlaid on type of each other. We
15 can easily calculate that, if you want to, we've got the
16 data, it's easy to figure that out.

17 We take the Berkeley intersection, Telegraph,
18 again the two equations, the adult parameters is the red,
19 the young bicyclists parameters in the yellow, and here
20 we're leaving out a lot of bicyclists, maybe even 20 percent
21 of the bicyclists are not making it across with those
22 criteria.

23 We -- this is the opposite direction, the same
24 intersection in Berkeley. Now, this is downhill, the other
25 one was uphill but, now when we get to the downhill grade,

1 the young bicyclist parameters are serving most of them,
2 there are only a few who don't make it with that set of
3 parameters.

4 We go on to the Davis trajectories and here the
5 adult parameters are really not serving most of the
6 population and even the young bicyclist parameters are
7 probably still leaving something like 15 or 20 percent out.

8 So, we need -- this is how much time it takes, this is real
9 data on real bicyclists.

10 And San Francisco, Polk Street, here these were
11 faster bicyclists, they were in a hurry. And notice,
12 surprising to us, four and a half percent downhill grade,
13 four and a half percent uphill grade, not that big a
14 difference for the standing starts. It turns out the
15 intersection itself is flat. So, the grades are on the
16 approaches, they're not actually in the intersection where
17 we're getting this data.

18 We had to throw out a lot of data points at this
19 intersection because so many of the bicyclists anticipated
20 the signal change, didn't even wait for the signal to change
21 before they got going. And if we take all of those
22 intersections and put them all together on one chart,
23 different colors for different intersections. Again, here's
24 where the two formulas show up, that's the one for adults,
25 this is the one for the young bicyclists. And we're leaving

1 a lot of people unserved.

2 Now, additional data collection, we have already
3 done this first intersection in Davis, we haven't analyzed
4 the data yet but we did collect the data. And there are
5 these other intersections, which I'll show you in Google
6 Earth images that we are planning on but, we are still open
7 to inputs if there are other places that we should look at
8 that are not on our list, where we can capture something
9 important.

10 This is the one in Davis, we've already collected
11 the data. Marina at Cervantes was suggested to us by
12 somebody in the City of San Francisco, because here we get
13 lots of recreational bicyclists. This is right along the
14 Marina and this is where we'll mount our video cameras so
15 that we can catch bicyclists crossing this access. This is
16 coming out of a parking lot onto Marina Boulevard right at
17 the Marina.

18 Market and Valencia is the one -- after a lot of
19 looking to try to find bicyclist left turns, this was
20 finally recommended to us by some bicyclists in San
21 Francisco. Left turn from Market onto Valencia, very heavy
22 bicycle traffic that way. So, now we can get a left turning
23 movement and see what effect we have there.

24 For a very wide intersection, Laurel Canyon at
25 Chandler in Los Angeles looks like the preferred site. This

1 is really wide because there's a bus way in the median and
2 this is a bike lane along this direction. So, we're
3 planning on getting some data there for a very wide
4 intersection and we expect a diverse bicycling population.

5 And then Venice Boulevard at Beethoven in Los Angeles,
6 again we're looking for leisure bicyclists, we were told
7 Venice Boulevard is a good place for that. This is a
8 relatively narrow intersection, so we're hoping we can get a
9 different bicycling population there.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Venice has bike lanes on
11 it.

12 MR. SHLADOVER: Yeah, yeah. And that's desirable
13 because then we get them concentrated in that location.

14 So, if there are other things that we should be
15 looking at, we can't afford to do more than that but, if
16 there's someplace else that would be good, we could
17 substitute for one of these, there's still time to make such
18 a substitution. The main thing was there's a lot of data
19 here.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you very
21 much. Any questions? Mr. Knowles?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: If I understood
23 correctly, one of the differences was you're measuring from
24 the beginning of the first conflict as they enter the
25 conflict lane to when they leave the last conflict lane,

1 whereas we were calculating it from the limit line itself
2 and assuming a second perception reaction time, in a very
3 slow, you know, acceleration rate in the very beginning of
4 that curve. So, it might take three seconds to get to the
5 first conflict lane from the limit line.

6 MR. SHLADOVER: Well, okay. But let's say we're
7 looking at this intersection here, we would say what happens
8 when they leave this curb to when they reach that curb on
9 the other side.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right, as opposed to
11 where -- I was trying to reconcile in my mind the
12 difference. We were assuming a one second perception
13 reaction time, you add three to five and a half, depending
14 on the intersection but --

15 MR. SHLADOVER: Yeah.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: -- we are measuring
17 a different point. We were going from the limit line,
18 starting there, whereas you're starting, you know, if that's
19 a 25 foot radius, you're starting 25 feet in advance of us.
20 And that would account for at least two or three seconds
21 difference.

22 MR. SHLADOVER: Oh no, no, no, we're not starting
23 25 -- we're not starting way back beyond the radius. I
24 mean if you're thinking we're starting back there, no, no,
25 no --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That's what --

2 MR. SHLADOVER: -- no, no, -- we're starting along
3 the curb line here, okay. When they're actually, you know,
4 on the pavement. But, you can adjust the W, you know, to
5 whichever width you want to deal with but, what we're trying
6 to make sure we capture is what happens when the green
7 starts? We've got to get them from the onset of the green.

8 So, this green line, on each of these plots, is when that
9 signal turns green. And what's important is that in many of
10 these cases it takes a good number of seconds from when that
11 green starts to when they start moving, and that's not
12 captured in most of anything that we've seen before.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: What I'm hearing is,
14 from the moment of green, we were looking at them about 20
15 feet back from the intersection, and from the moment of
16 green to the moment you start measuring movement is -- they
17 have to traverse 20 feet from the limit line to the
18 prolongation of the curb face.

19 MR. SHLADOVER: Okay. I don't think we're talking
20 about the same thing. Because, you know, let's say this
21 start line here would be the curb edge. Now, some of them
22 are starting behind it, all of those guys there are behind
23 that start line. These happen to be in front of it. Let's
24 say at Polk, yeah, they were out in the pedestrian
25 crosswalk, that's what's happening at Polk, a lot of them

1 get into the pedestrian crossing, so they're not even
2 starting all the way back at the, where they should be
3 legally. They're in the pedestrian crosswalk, that's where
4 all of these guys are here. But, we need to get the whole
5 trajectory to get what they're doing from when that green
6 starts. And you can draw your line anywhere else you want
7 along there but, these are the actual trajectories that they
8 follow when they're moving.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Any other
10 questions? Mr. Fisher?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yeah. Based on the data
12 and the analysis that you've conducted to date, if the
13 objective is to accommodate 85 percent of the bicyclists
14 from the limit line to the end of the last conflicting lane,
15 do you see any reason at this time to deviate from the six
16 second start up time and the 14.7 feet per second cruise
17 speed?

18 MR. SHLADOVER: At this point, no. We would see -
19 - after we collect additional data, we might come to a
20 different conclusion but, based on what we know right now,
21 no, I wouldn't see any reason to deviate from that.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
23 questions from --? Thank you very much, as always, we
24 really appreciate your very thorough presentation and good
25 research.

1 Ma'am?

2 MS. KEEYAN: Hi. Welcome to San Diego. I've
3 stayed here till 3:00 o'clock to let me say that. Again, my
4 name is Kathy Keeyan, I'm with the San Diego County Bicycle
5 Coalition. I represent 1400 cyclists from all around San
6 Diego County. They couldn't all be here today, luckily for
7 you so, I'm going to try to speak for them. And some of
8 them have stuck it out, thank you, you guys who are still
9 here, appreciate that.

10 I think, you know, I struggled with what to say to
11 you all and it's been -- thank you for letting me sit
12 through the presentations before talking to you, because I
13 think we start from a different perspective. Right now
14 intersections don't work for us. I mean I think the idea
15 somehow that the status quo that everything is working fine
16 and there aren't any impacts currently on the cycling
17 population is wrong. The reason that this legislation was
18 put together is because we have a problem. We can't get
19 through the intersections in the time it takes. Many times
20 the intersections don't see us.

21 I'm glad to see that the detection is available
22 there, and I do want to say right up front we support CBAC's
23 recommendations to you. We understand that this is a moving
24 target for all of you, it's new for traffic engineers.
25 There's going to be some learning and some stuff that goes

1 on. So, we definitely support the idea of accommodating new
2 technologies. If you can detect us in the middle of the
3 intersection and make sure we get all the way through, all
4 right, we're right there with you. If we can get some data
5 that shows that we're getting through intersections faster
6 than you anticipated, great, let's revise the standards.

7 But, right now, we want you to accept the
8 conservative estimates for what it takes to get us through
9 those intersections. It's a safety and encouragement thing
10 for the cycling community. Right now the standard is that
11 we're left in the middle of a lot of intersections on the
12 minimum green time. The minimum green plus yellow plus red,
13 I'm still in the middle of the intersection. I'm not a fast
14 cyclist, I'm a slow cyclist, I'm kind of on that 20 percent
15 end there, and I'd like to be able to get through this
16 intersection safely. Our bicyclists would like to be able
17 to get through those intersections safely, and we want you
18 to be conservative in how you calculate our safety.

19 We've been waiting for these recommendations for a
20 really long time. We're so happy that they finally made it
21 into the MUTCD. We'd like to see no moratorium, let's get
22 them implemented and see how they work. Do the research
23 with the policies in place and see how they work, let's not
24 mess around two months after they've been decided upon to
25 change the parameters and the criteria.

1 I did want to talk about a couple of the detailed
2 pieces, just that we want to make sure that that last
3 conflicting lane really is the last conflicting lane. I was
4 seeing in the intersection diagram, where you were talking
5 about if there was a left, the allowed left phase, to make
6 sure that, you know, U-turns are taken into account, and
7 every possible movement at that intersection we need to make
8 sure we're not going to be conflicting with that. So, if
9 you guys can do that, we don't have a problem with including
10 the last conflicting lane things.

11 We do -- there was some language that I wanted to
12 be clear. You guys asked for something simple. We're
13 asking you for something simple. Get us through the
14 intersection before the light turns green for the oncoming
15 traffic so we don't get hit. That's really what it boils
16 down to. I'm going to trust you guys' engineering judgment
17 and the really good work that's been done already and that
18 will be done, to make sure that the data reflects reality.
19 Keep the guidelines that you have, let's see how they work,
20 let's do the experimentation, see how they work and come
21 back and revisit it in a year and see how it's doing. Thank
22 you.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you Kathy.

24

25 Yes, Ma'am?

1 MS. HAWKING: My name is Julie Hawking and I'm a
2 cyclist in San Diego. I'm not the fastest cyclist and I'm
3 comfortable making lefthand turns in traffic by using the
4 lefthand turn pockets, and I was pretty horrified at
5 thinking that I'm going to have to do that at 18 miles per
6 hour, if your recommendations are acted upon. Now, I
7 understand that I don't know a lot about traffic engineering
8 and that maybe you're not expecting me to go from a standing
9 start to 18 miles per hour in a lefthand turn pocket, but I
10 don't ride at 18 miles per hour anytime that I'm riding my
11 bicycle. So, I appreciate the information that solar
12 cyclists can be accommodated at 14 or 15 mile an hour as
13 sort of a benchmark is a good thing. I'm comfortable
14 riding, just in general, at 10 to 12 miles an hour, I'm a
15 casual cyclist and that's what's makes me happy, and I would
16 also be happy to get through intersections in a reasonable
17 way, as a vehicular cyclist who is being able to use traffic
18 devices and methods to get through traffic. So, I just
19 wanted to share that.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you very
21 much, appreciate it.

22 You sir?

23 MR. LEONE: My name is Robert Leone, I'm with the
24 San Diego County Bicycle Coalition. I'm happy to report
25 that two-thirds of my points have been obviated by excellent

1 technical information. Thank you very much.

2 First of all, allowing conflicting traffic to move
3 before a cyclist has cleared the intersection may not lead
4 to conflict in terms of actual physical contact but, it can
5 be very intimidating.

6 Second, if a cyclist is making a left turn, and
7 the conflicting, the last lane of conflict is the oncoming
8 right turn lane, especially if there's been flow through due
9 to right turn on red, it's possible that the motorist in the
10 right turn lane will not be starting from a stop when his
11 light turns green. That he'll be in motion coming up to
12 that intersection, coming up to that right turn bay. That's
13 something that I sort of want to see taken into account on
14 the timing for the left turn lanes. Thank you.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you.

16 MR. BAROSS: I'm going to try to, I've got notes
17 all over the place. I'm Jim Baross, I'm the Vice President
18 of the California Bicycle Advisory Committee. I've got some
19 other things, I'm representing the California Bicycle
20 Coalition, the California Association of Bicycling
21 Organizations, and the League of American Bicyclists, so I
22 get to talk for an hour.

23 (Laughter.)

24 MR. BAROSS: I won't. First, from CBAC, from the
25 California Bicycle Advisory --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: If you have
2 anything new that hasn't been said, you have the floor.

3 MR. BAROSS: Here we go. On the first point, the
4 point that was an area of compromise between CBAC and
5 Mr. Knowles and the traffic engineers that he brought to
6 that interesting four hour meeting, thank you very much.

7 If supplemental technology has been deployed that
8 can reliably distinguish bicycles from other traffic,
9 clearance times may be adjusted, not just reduced, okay. We
10 may find it takes longer for the cyclist to get through.
11 I'm hoping that technology can be developed so that we know
12 when someone is in the intersection, and we don't try to put
13 cross traffic in there while anybody is there. Some day
14 that will be available but, that was important, it's not
15 just reduced, it's adjusted.

16 Tenth percentile, I think we've covered pretty
17 well, I'm not going to get into that.

18 The concern about the environment and greenhouse
19 gases, quite frankly floored me. One of the reasons I and
20 many other cyclists are actually doing any bicycling at all,
21 besides the fun and saving some money, is trying to save the
22 world. We're 100 percent greenhouse gas reduction every
23 time somebody gets out of a car and into a bike. And to
24 tell me that I'm delaying a motorist and that's going to
25 cause a big -- yes, you can multiply those things out but,

1 in your calculations you made no allowances for those
2 motorists who might face a red light for a little longer
3 than they'd like and say, gee, maybe I ought to be riding a
4 bike and get the heck out of that car and take that other
5 choice for some of their short trips.

6 Also, the notion that -- and it's actually true
7 I'm sure -- that motorists, and me, I'm a motorist too by
8 the way on occasion, that if I see an all red situation or a
9 long signal phase where I feel delayed, and I decide to go
10 through that intersection in violation of the law, that's my
11 fault, I'm in violation. So, if we're going to balance
12 allowing the cyclist to get through safely, versus allowing
13 the violator to get through safely, or to set up a situation
14 where they're less likely to violate, you know where I'm
15 coming down. Overall I'm looking for, and I'm seeing this
16 disagreement, you know, a different approach as an issue of
17 safety, of some people who want to make an appropriate
18 transportation choice against the convenience, may I say it,
19 of motorists, maybe still making an appropriate choice for
20 themselves but, conveniences versus safety, I don't think
21 there's an argument.

22 Now I'm going to get a little -- some of the
23 people I represent are looking for reparations. Now, I
24 don't support that but, they're looking for years and years
25 of being set to the side of the road, when under the law we

1 have an equal opportunity to use the road. 21-200 says we
2 bicyclists have equal rights, equal responsibilities. Well,
3 for over 40 years -- I'm not going to shout -- for over 40
4 years the traffic engineering profession has failed to
5 accommodate all road users. Over 40 years. So, I'm very
6 upset, pounding my chest, 40 years. The Legislature, we
7 convinced, maybe inappropriately some people might think,
8 over two years ago that it's about time that you, Jeff, it's
9 about time you accommodated bicyclists. And if that delays
10 some motorists, or all motorists, that's okay, because we're
11 supposed to be accommodating everybody. That was over two
12 years ago. Jeff, you and this Committee worked very hard to
13 come up with some standards, they're in place now. We, I,
14 and the organizations I support, support more study. We
15 support some tweaking of this, after all it's been 40 years
16 of doing it wrong, 40 years of doing it wrong, it's about
17 time we start doing it right. And if we make some mistakes,
18 err on the side of safety, I think that's okay until we get
19 some more better definitions.

20 I think I have just a couple more things. Oh, as
21 far as warrants, if we're going to come up with warrants for
22 when things are to be adjusted, the warrants should be for
23 when there are no cyclists, when there is no reason to
24 accommodate a bicyclist, then I can see being able to err
25 from the standards that are put in place.

1 I think I've got it.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you
3 very much for your time.

4 Any other members of the public who wish to
5 address the Committee?

6 (No response.)

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Seeing none, I
8 close the public hearing part of it and bring it back to the
9 Committee. We had some very good presentations, both from
10 Mr. Knowles and the Berkeley people, a good presentation
11 from OCTA staff, and we had some very good input from like
12 the practical policy point and all that stuff. So, now what
13 is the Committee's pleasure? Mr. Mansourian?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Well, I can kind of
15 share with you what my thoughts are. I mean I came into
16 this meeting today, not being the guy in the restroom, since
17 Dave said it was him but, really being torn because we spend
18 a lot of time, we clearly heard what the intent of the
19 Legislatures were, whether we agree or not it's irrelevant,
20 they make the policies, our job is to implement or help
21 Caltrans implement. So, I came to the meeting today really
22 with my eyes open. When Jeff and Orange County made their
23 presentation, you guys made a lot of good presentations, a
24 lot of things that made sense. Then I heard Steve's
25 presentation that doesn't get emotional, says the facts are

1 facts, you know, what was that old police show that we used
2 to watch, you know, it's just the facts Ma'am, you know, he
3 didn't get excited, just said here it is. And I think so
4 for me the question really, and I wrote myself a note, is
5 based on what we heard today, then is a second look
6 warranted? Should we reopen the whole thing based on what
7 we heard? And if we do open it, then, you know, who should
8 do it, when should do it, how should do it, so we get it
9 right and a month from now somebody else doesn't come in and
10 give us some good more facts.

11 But, after hearing Steve, I think that what we
12 have is good for now, but, I'm very open and very interested
13 in finishing his study. And I'd love to ask the incoming
14 Chairman that when UC Berkeley is finished with their study,
15 that we set aside a half day, not a workshop, but a half day
16 one item, so we don't have to rush through, and come in next
17 time early, whenever that next time is, and really look at
18 the data. And at that time, if changes need to be made, and
19 if tweaking needs to be made, or substantial changes need to
20 be made, then it's all based on not emotions but based on
21 real facts. So, that's really where I am, because I, again
22 with Steve's presentation, but, I do agree, and I want to
23 acknowledge probably the headache we're causing a lot of you
24 in Orange County and elsewhere, you must spend millions of
25 dollars, you know, tying all your intersections together and

1 here we show up and we mess it up, but we're an arm of a
2 Legislature who decided it's time for us to do this, right
3 or wrong, or for years, you know. Some of us young guys
4 weren't around when all those injustice was done but, so to
5 me that's what the issue is, is I'm not convinced that I
6 need to reopen it but I'm very eager to follow up and get a
7 full report with adequate time for us to reconsider it
8 again.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you.

10 Who's next? Let's go Jeff, we'll come back to you
11 later. Mr. Henley?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. Believe it or
13 not, I predate Caltrans and Caltrans was created to be a
14 multi-mobile agency. And we've talked about it for a long,
15 long time and I think what's happened is we haven't moved
16 fast enough and that's so now we're getting the Legislature
17 to start to help us do our job. And one of the things they
18 said is, we want bicyclists to be considered at
19 intersections, and that's just one of the things. And I
20 think we, as CTCDC, have done our best to implement the
21 Legislation. Ours is not, you know, I saw the delay
22 calculations and the tons of pollution and all that stuff, I
23 remember doing that 35 years ago when we first created DOTP.
24 We would look at all the alternatives and then of course
25 transit and bicycles always came out on top but, we never

1 did anything about it. But now we're starting to do
2 something and I think, you know, we've done our thing right
3 now and it's, you know, as far as the policy we have right
4 now should stay until we see a real good reason to change.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you.

6 Chief?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I think there were a
8 lot of valid points brought up today. I echo what the first
9 two members said. It took a long time to get to this. But
10 I acknowledge the fact that Jeff was expressing concerns,
11 you know, at the very beginning with what we were coming up
12 with. I think that there are a multitude of things you are
13 considering at once. You are considering the effects on the
14 environment, you are considering the effects on the effected
15 movement of transportation and goods, that is part of our
16 charge as well as the safety aspects. Mr. Baross made a
17 very good point that, you know, do you take away the bicycle
18 safety because you want to keep motorists from intentionally
19 deciding to break the law to enter the intersection on the
20 red but, I don't think you can ignore the fact that that
21 does happen. That when you do increase people's
22 frustration, and you have people sitting around looking at
23 each other and everything is red and nobody is doing
24 anything, you do create a situation at times where you
25 decrease overall safety because you get people so frustrated

1 they start doing stupid stuff. So, there is a balancing
2 act, but I think that at this point I haven't heard anything
3 that makes me say we need to turn the whole thing upside
4 down and start over again at this point, and I think
5 following through with the studies is a very good start.

6 And I also just want to say that I appreciate the
7 objective input that we got today from all sides. It was a
8 very objective conversation and I feel it was very
9 productive. And as a panel member, Committee member, I
10 appreciate that.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you.

12 Mr. Fisher?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, I was very
14 impressed by the amount of thought that has gone into this
15 subject, whether you're for the current guidelines or you
16 think the current guidelines are lacking, I just think a lot
17 of thought has gone into this from all perspectives, and so
18 everyone is to be commended for doing their homework on it.

19 I think we have to acknowledge that in some cases
20 this will incrementally degrade the operation of the
21 intersection, especially where bicycle usage may be very
22 light. On the other hand, the Legislature has spoken, and
23 they've indicated that despite that we need to come up with
24 guidelines that provide for the detection of bicyclists and
25 provide for the related signal time for bicyclists. And I

1 think that's what we attempted to do. So, I think we have
2 no choice but to continue to go forward with implementing
3 this, until such time that other data comes forward that may
4 change our minds.

5 Regarding the situations you showed, Jeff, I would
6 acknowledge that given different geometries of the
7 intersection, and given different signal phasing and such,
8 that you could calculate the last conflicting lane to be
9 here in this situation and here in that situation, under
10 unique circumstances. I think the current language allows
11 you to make that appropriate interpretation. It says to the
12 end of the last conflicting lane, and there's no drawing
13 involved. And so if you've got a special situation and your
14 left turns on the cross street always follow the bike lanes
15 and such, and the thru move doesn't go with it and all sorts
16 of things, I think you can justify that under the current
17 guidelines. Rather than trying to define every possibility
18 that may exist, I think the current guidelines allow you to
19 make a reasonable interpretation without getting too
20 specific.

21 But, I agree with what Dave Roseman said, there's
22 needs to be some simplicity in this process. We could
23 create a number of tables, we could create a number of
24 diagrams that say if this, do this, if this, do that, but I
25 think there's -- we should have some simplicity. For

1 example, with yellow signal time, that's a whole complicated
2 issue regarding the limit zones and perception reaction time
3 and who's the aggressive driver and who is the shy driver,
4 and all that information has been taken into account and
5 wham, we've got the table for yellow times, and we didn't
6 make it too complicated, it was just based on some
7 assumptions. And so I think we need to keep it simple.

8 For me, I'll go where the data takes us. If the
9 new data should show that another cruise speed through the
10 intersection is more appropriate than the current 14.7 feet
11 per second that we're using now, or the start up time should
12 be longer or shorter, should that data come forward, I'd be
13 more than happy to consider that. But, I think as of right
14 now, with the very complete studies that Berkeley has
15 conducted, I'm compelled to go with that until we see
16 something that's more compelling to us.

17 So, as of right now, since the directive is only a
18 few months old, and we don't have any, at least in my view,
19 any compelling reason to adopt something different, I would
20 say let's keep it as it is for now until we have new
21 information that comes to us, that suggests we should change
22 it.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you.

24 Ms. Wong?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: I agree. I think there

1 was a lot of good information from both sides and I think
2 the study was, you know, really great new information that
3 we haven't really seen, and I think to move things forward
4 we should go with the best information available until we
5 have new information that tells us otherwise. And I think
6 the point made about this being, you know, about bicycle
7 safety versus vehicle convenience perhaps I think it's
8 important to realize that on the one hand if the goals are
9 too long, vehicles may violate but, at the same time if
10 they're too short the bicyclists are going to violate and,
11 you know, make sure that they can get through the
12 intersection. So, there's definitely trade-offs and we have
13 to find a good balance for both.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Babico?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah, I heard very
16 valuable information about this issue, but the bottom line
17 and concern of mine, we should not undermine traffic safety
18 at the intersection no matter what we do.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Than you.

20 Now, Mr. Knowles, I'll give you a few minutes
21 before I do my thing.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I mean even as a
23 starting point, using Caltrans' memo summarizing the
24 consensus at the Bicycle Advisory Committee, I would put
25 forward I don't see a downside to adding new language to

1 this section that allows the use of supplemental detection
2 or new technology to either distinguish bicycles from other
3 traffic or to -- right now I understand what John is saying
4 with regards to phase sequencing but, clearly every formula
5 and all the language in the section says from the limit
6 line, from the limit line, from the limit line -- it doesn't
7 allow for detection beyond the limit line. And I don't see
8 a downside, and even the bicycle committee saw the advantage
9 of using technology, even AAA in the minutes from the May
10 meeting made mention of new technology, so I don't see,
11 since both of my video detection vendors say they can link
12 to the controller and do detection just like we do traffic
13 counting in the intersection during the green phase, I don't
14 see a downside to inserting the language as I proposed, the
15 third to the last sentence on page four of the attachment,
16 you know, supplemental reference bicycle rider detection
17 zones, new technology or various signal, you know, may
18 affect a calculation of the minimum green, yellow and red
19 time. So, I hate to come away from this discussion not even
20 gaining the compromises that the bicycle committee could
21 see, could at least create balance, because my problem is,
22 if I go back to my agency and I'm facing the standard says
23 limit line, I'm using video technology, I can set up
24 detection zones within the intersection that provide that
25 adequate clearance time, then I'm starting down the path

1 already of writing an engineering finding about why I'm not
2 going to follow the standard. And once I start writing, I'm
3 going to keep on writing. And my point to the bicycle
4 committee was, let's come up with a workable compromise, or
5 else you're going to have all kinds of agencies not
6 following this timing policy. And the goal is to try to
7 make everybody meet everybody's needs. So, I would say
8 there's legitimate points with regard to the supplemental
9 timing, I understand what we're saying about the phase
10 sequencing and that, you know, there's enough language
11 already in there to allow the engineer to have that
12 discretion but, even in talking to the Committee about the
13 limited amount of data available, and the different traffic
14 volumes and bicycle volumes from place to place, they agreed
15 that if the local agency had data that supported other
16 travel speeds, left turn volumes, the absolute absence of
17 bicycle traffic at certain times of the day or at certain
18 obscure intersections, you know, we didn't say this type of
19 intersection obviously the standard doesn't apply but, they
20 did allow, in the third bullet point of the memo, to provide
21 some engineering discretion based on the local experience
22 and engineering judgment with regards to, you know, travel
23 speed. So, I'm just surprised that with everything that
24 we're weighing here, that the policy might stand as is
25 instead of doing some of these things that even the cyclists

1 recognize could help moderate the policy and make it more
2 palatable so more cities would actually apply the policy,
3 because our goal is detection and accommodating signal
4 timing and therefore too restrictive. Like the 50
5 percentile, some cities will just ignore the new standard.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you. I
7 have a few thoughts. This has been very educational
8 session, at least for me, and regardless of whatever the
9 Committee decides at the end, I learned a lot and I for one
10 appreciate it.

11 On the macro level, it's a State Legislature
12 decision. They have decided, and it's their prerogative,
13 that's the way our system works, they have decided to
14 introduce additional delay inter-transportation system.
15 They knew that. That's a policy question. We cannot go
16 there, that's not our purview. If anybody here disagrees
17 with that, we have to run for office, become an Assembly
18 person or become a Senator and go introduce a bill and
19 revoke AB15-81. Until that time, that's the state law.
20 They knew all this stuff, they knew that they are
21 introducing delay, that they're introducing all kinds of
22 inconvenience. Maybe sometimes overly exaggerated but,
23 still inconvenience at some locations.

24 So, I hear you. I like the presentation given by
25 OCTA, very valid points. But, there is a Legislative

1 process and there is a time to make those decisions, and to
2 make those arguments. The Cities and the Counties, they
3 have paid lobbyists and full time staff in Sacramento that
4 are tracking every single bill, even for punctuation errors,
5 and they have ample time to go and make these arguments in
6 front of Legislature when they were looking at 15-81, to
7 make an argument or put provisions in there. That's not --
8 so, I for one, if you come and you tell me that this thing
9 is going to introduce, it's going to double the air
10 pollution in California, I will feel very bad but, that's
11 not of the concern of this group. Somebody else makes those
12 decisions, the people in Sacramento, they get paid to make
13 that decision. They did the balancing act.

14 To make an example, OCTA, for example, they just
15 cut 150,000 hours of transit service hours and they most
16 probably will have to cut another 150,000 hours. San Diego,
17 they just cut 400,000 hours of transit service in San Diego,
18 because people in Sacramento, they decided they don't want
19 to put money in transit operation. So, it doesn't matter
20 whether you like transit or you don't like transit, somebody
21 else in Sacramento makes those decisions.

22 So, on the macro level, that's the way I see it.
23 I understand your point, Mr. Knowles, I for one think that
24 maybe those details, it may be better handled, and again
25 it's a thought, I'm open to hear the other views, maybe

1 those details might be better handled exactly with what you
2 said, because if we start addressing every specific case,
3 where do you draw the line? But, with the cases that you
4 mentioned, for example the technology and all of that, this
5 is a guidance language, it's not a standard. And then you
6 have the 15-81 language as a backup that tells you you have
7 to use local conditions and engineering, professional
8 engineering practice. So, if you can justify it, you can
9 justify, you don't have to comply with the guidance. But, I
10 understand jurisdictions are going to be a little hesitant
11 because we don't want to get in front of a jury and argue
12 why you didn't comply with the guidance language, and you
13 have to define your engineering paper, they're going to
14 bring their expert witness and all that.

15 So, we have two choices here. We can either allow
16 this to stand as is, or at least try to accommodate maybe
17 the first bullet, which apparently CBAC has had some
18 concurrence, and I didn't hear otherwise, that the people,
19 the bicycle experts and bicycle advocates, they have some
20 concurrence that we can accommodate use of technology as a
21 means to more efficient time signals.

22 Is there any willing, on the part of the Committee
23 to even look at Item No. 1, or bullet one, or you don't want
24 to touch anything?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: You know, the 2070

1 controllers, you know, when they went the upgrade from the
2 170 to 2070, they're sitting there with nothing to do most
3 of the time. And there's all sorts of analysis they could
4 be doing about what's going on at an intersection to improve
5 things, and it's for us to just go back and say we're going
6 to continue to do it the way we've always done it with
7 mechanical controllers or whatever, is really a mistake.
8 So, I think we should be open to using technology to try to
9 make that intersection a little better. But, remember, the
10 bottom line, we want to get the bicyclists through safely,
11 now, however we do that, whether it's the table, whether
12 it's video processing, I mean that's what engineers do.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, is there,
14 okay --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: My recommendation
16 is that Jeff makes that a motion and then we get a second
17 and vote on it, as opposed to --

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, yeah --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: -- because it's on
20 the agenda, so he can make it.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- because you
22 have five specific proposals, five bullets.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Just make them one.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I pretty much do
25 not see a lot of appetite in the Committee to go for Item 2

1 through 5, but I see some willingness maybe on No. 1, if
2 that's critical, or if it can help this specific case. So,
3 if you're willing to make a motion, see if you get a second,
4 see what happens.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, give me a moment,
6 I want to look at the exact language in the Caltrans memo,
7 check it against what I wrote three months ago.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Do you want me to
9 go back to the item, to go to Item 10-5 and come back to
10 this?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I've got it right here.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You got it, okay.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay. So, I'll make a
14 motion based on the Caltrans memo, and we can wordsmith this
15 after I make the motion but, okay. So, in the options
16 section that's talking --

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Which page are
18 you looking at in the report?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Page four of my letter.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Page four of your
21 letter, okay.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Again, the third
23 sentence --

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Third sentence.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- from the bottom.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- from the
2 bottom. Where it says, "Supplemental Reference Bicycle"?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Correct.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So, my recommendation
6 is to modify the existing language that was recommended by
7 the Committee back in May, and adopted, I think, September
8 by the Director from Caltrans, that supplemental reference
9 -- and we can go with a different words -- we referred to
10 the reference bicycle riders, so I commented a reference to
11 bicycle rider detection zone, this basically shifts the
12 measurement of the W distance from the limit line to
13 wherever we've put the detection, even if it's in the
14 intersection.

15 So, "Supplemental reference bicycle rider
16 detection zones new technology for various signal controller
17 settings may be utilized to reduce the time that's green
18 plus yellow plus red clear, and/or travel distance, which is
19 W in that equation, that bicycles are opposed to conflicting
20 vehicular traffic."

21 So, that gives me the tools I need to keep the
22 existing table, all the other existing language and simply
23 use "detection" to change the W distance in the formula.
24 And as was mentioned before, there was a concern over
25 "reduce" and it was recommended that we use "adjust", so I

1 would concede to that. That gives me flexibility to still
2 reduce or just adjust.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, adjust is
4 up or down.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes, yes.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, your
7 motion is to add the language that says, "Supplemental
8 reference bicycle cross rider detections on the
9 (indiscernible) blah, blah, blah --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: To adjust the
12 time, green minimum, yellow, red, clear and/or travel
13 distance W, the bicyclist are exposed to conflicting
14 vehicular traffic.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's your
17 motion. There's a motion. Is there a second for that
18 motion?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: A second for
20 discussion.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, there is a
22 motion and a second for discussion. So, there is one single
23 thing -- well -- do you have something very important?

24 MR. KEITH: Jeff, did that W --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: You have to speak into

1 the mic.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, you have to
3 go to the -- he cannot get you. The reason we are being a
4 little bit flexible, I don't want to come back next meeting
5 with another proposal, so.

6 MR. KEITH: My question is -- this is Ron Keith
7 speaking again from OCTA -- my question is, is the current
8 table, the W, included the bicycle clearing the intersection
9 all the way around the curb return?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. In this
11 particular case, the suggestion is leave every single word,
12 every formula exactly as it is and all we're saying is we
13 can adjust that W distance using this new technology that
14 basically allows us to take the detection into the
15 intersection. But the feeling of the Committee, as I take
16 it, is nobody wants to change much of anything, we're just
17 talking about using that technology to change that W
18 distance.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you.
20 I made an exception, usually when we close the public
21 hearing --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: If I may, I don't have
23 exact language because this predates our meeting but, one of
24 the things I didn't mention in my recommendation was
25 incorporating the language that includes the ability to

1 modify signal timing based on technology that can reliably
2 distinguish bicycles from other traffic.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's your
4 motion and we have a second, and now discussion.

5 Mr. Mansourian?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: You know, the
7 gentleman you said, that got off signal timing in
8 California.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Chalap.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I see you have a big
11 question. Do you mind, Mr. Chairman, if I --

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, no, because
13 if --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: You have a big
15 question in your face. Is what we're proposing helping or
16 -- you need to come up here, sorry.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Chalap, Chalap.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, Chalap, you.
19 So, my question, while you're walking up is, we don't want
20 to make things worse. This gives a tool, another tool,
21 without changing the structure. Are we on the right track?

22 MR. SADAM: What we do now, if you go with this
23 approach, well, it helps with the single timing but it also
24 a whole lot of cost, like every controller needs to be
25 upgraded, the software needs to be upgraded. This is a big

1 cost, it's not a simple solution.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Only if you choose,
3 we're not requiring you to have new technology. We're
4 saying if you choose to have new technology and you can
5 prove that you get the bicycle safe to the other side, then
6 the W can be adjusted.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, there's one other
8 point.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Correct, that's what
10 we're talking about.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But one other point to
12 address your concern, this option of bicycle signal timing
13 only applies when you have installed bicycle sensor
14 detection. So, you're already putting in new hardware. So,
15 part of this goes into the selection of that hardware. As
16 long as I'm putting in a new video camera to take the place
17 of loops, I'm not having to -- I was already putting in the
18 video camera, now I just need to change the way I'm
19 programming it, it doesn't really change my hardware needs.

20 Another engineer using a different controller might be
21 affected differently if he doesn't have that many detector
22 inputs. But for me, it's almost cost neutral. I just
23 wanted a tool that doesn't force me to time the bike all the
24 way across the intersection, I can use detection to deal
25 with.

1 MR. SADAM: I agree. I think it's basically if
2 you have the technology and if you have the equipment, you
3 can handle that. But, if you have a really outdated
4 controller or obsolete, then you have to think a lot of cost
5 to do that.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: This is just --
7 this gives one more tool to the traffic engineers to
8 consider when they are doing a new signal or a signal
9 modification project, to say, if I put this kind of
10 detection and this kind of software patch, I can do it. So,
11 that's a local decision.

12 MR. SADAM: It is.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Thank you.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: I'm inclined not to
16 support the motion, for this reason, editorially, if we have
17 an option statement that modifies a guidance statement, we
18 need to tie the two together. You should do this, except as
19 shown in the option below, or something to that effect. So,
20 we haven't done that yet.

21 The second thing is, I don't know how this really
22 works. With the limit line detection zone, you detect a
23 bicyclist on the red, so that when he gets the green, enough
24 time is provided. My understanding is, with intersectional
25 or detection within the intersection, you're detecting the

1 bicyclist during the green and you could have a blind spot.

2 A bicyclist is slow getting into the intersection, and the
3 bicyclist is here and your detection is there, at some point
4 you're going to say there's no bicyclist there, I can
5 terminate the green early. So, I think we need to look at
6 this just a little bit more carefully. I'm not sure how
7 this technology works or what the pros and cons are.

8 My other thought is that if we are going to get
9 more data from Berkeley, I don't think we want to keep
10 amending this every four months. We may want to consider
11 this option, once we know a little bit more about the
12 detection, after we get the data from Berkeley, and if there
13 are going to be any changes as a result of that, we change
14 it one time. Those are my reservations.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Whatever decision
16 or recommendation we make, it may take a good two or three
17 months before Caltrans issues any policy directive anyway.
18 I mean it's not going to happen tomorrow.

19 Jacob, you have something? Ms. Wong?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Well, Jeff did mention
21 that he received some recent calls that the video detection
22 wasn't tracking all the bicyclists, so --

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, that was a
24 question I had. You said that somebody said that even with
25 the video detection it cannot be done?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That's what I heard
2 from one engineer. As I said, I haven't received any
3 complaints of that nature but, it did raise the concern,
4 since none of this has been tested, that I don't know
5 whether -- maybe the engineer from Long Beach knows, if they
6 ever took out the design bicyclists, the referenced
7 bicyclist rider, 90 pounds small non-iron frame, and
8 actually tested to see how well it was detected by
9 technology neutral sorts of detection.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let me ask, give
11 a few minutes to the Chief first.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: But, we're not
13 recommending specific technology, we're not referencing
14 video technology, we're not doing any of that. So, if we're
15 just saying that the engineer has the ability to use
16 technology if it's available, doesn't it then fall back to
17 that engineer's city and the liability it has to them to
18 make sure it works right?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: We're not telling them
21 to use certain things, I don't really see --

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It gives them
23 only flexible --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right, it's just an
25 option.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Dave?

2 MR. ROSEMAN: There are varying --

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Introduce
4 yourself.

5 MR. ROSEMAN: Dave Roseman, City of Long Beach.
6 There's various video detection systems, some apparently do
7 not detect, I can tell you some don't even detect my vehicle
8 that I drive. And then some newer ones are supposed to be
9 able to detect this reference bicycle. That was the reason
10 for creating the reference bicycle, to have manufacturers be
11 able to build to a standard, a standard that we weren't sure
12 that all manufacturers could attain.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, it
14 could be that the older video technology out there, video
15 detection technology does not detect period. It does not
16 have anything to do with this bill or anything else.

17 Steve, do you have something to share with us?

18 MR. SHLADOVER: Yes. Steve Shladover from U.C.
19 Berkeley. As part of our project, we were asked to test
20 some of the detection systems with the reference bicycle and
21 the reference rider. And with the video detection systems
22 it depends a lot on the setup. There are many parameters
23 that can be adjusted in those systems and a lot of tradeoffs
24 in performance. So, with some jiggering (sic) around with
25 the system, it was possible to get it to detect the

1 reference bicyclist but, the settings have to be just right
2 to do that. And there are a lot of tradeoffs in how you set
3 those settings.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you.

5 Okay, so we are going a little bit out of our norm
6 and we are allowing interaction from the public because I
7 don't want this thing to be back -- actually, it's not my
8 problem, it's going to be Mr. Fisher's problem.

9 So, there is a motion and there is a second, and
10 we've had discussion. There was a point that Mr. Fisher
11 brought up, and you mentioned that you are talking about
12 even if you want to do this there must be some reference in
13 the actual guidance language, is that what you said?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Right. We want an
15 option to modify the guidance language, so you can't have
16 them in two different places, you have to tie them together.
17 And basically my understanding is the format goes, the
18 guidance statement, except as provided in the option below.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, are you
20 suggesting the option be moved to what part of the code? If
21 you want to entertain --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, I don't know.
23 This needs to be word smithed and I'm kind of thinking, you
24 know, it may take more than just that to make it all
25 correct.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Can we approve
2 the concept and leave that to Caltrans' staff, even if you
3 want to entertain the concept? Which we normally, sometimes
4 we do. We approve the concept to allow the use of this
5 language and then Mr. Bhullar is going to decide where is
6 the appropriate fit for that option to go in the section.
7 Is that okay, Johnny?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Why don't we -- if
9 that's the case, and with John being chairman, then we can
10 have them work with John, and then you can just give us the
11 final language as this is what we did.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Very good.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No hearing.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There is no
15 hearing, we are just voting on the concept whether the
16 language to allow the new technology be used to adjust the W
17 and the timing as it may be appropriate, depending on
18 technology. That's the concept that we are making the
19 recommendation to Caltrans and then leave it to Caltrans to
20 work the specific language and with the text.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: But also don't you have
22 to identify the reference user?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Of course.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: As part of that
25 detection technology.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's what the
2 language says, it says the reference bicyclist, the
3 reference rider.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: But that's in regard to
5 the detection zone at the limit line. So, now, if we're
6 going to use alternate detection that detects during the
7 green, I think we need to specify that it has to detect the
8 reference bicycle user.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I refer to it as
10 supplemental reference bicycle detection zone.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Oh, this would be in
12 addition to the limit line detection zone?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Correct, correct.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So, you have a limit
15 line detection zone which must provide a minimum green time,
16 and then you have the supplemental detector that adds on to
17 it or shortens it?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Correct. It's
19 basically an extension detector in the intersection, so it
20 would work equally for a bicyclist or for a slow moving
21 accelerating traffic.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So, that could only add
23 onto it, right?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Correct, it could not
25 reduce.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: It couldn't reduce it.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Correct. It just
3 reduces my required 24/7 minimum green time, because now I
4 have the means of extending it if I detect a slow moving
5 vehicle. So, instead of putting a extension detector in
6 advance of the intersection, I get to put one after the
7 limit line to provide that detection. And in terms of the
8 linkage, I noticed in the staff report from May, there
9 already was an option, if this made it into the final
10 section, so after support there was an option that said a
11 limit line detection system that can demonstrate --
12 discriminate between bicyclists and vehicles, may be used to
13 extend the length of the minimum green. Now, what I was
14 doing was immediately after that option, went to the
15 supplemental detection zone. So, I think it's linked and is
16 appropriate coming right after the discussion that
17 apparently is already in the section about limit line
18 detection that can discriminate between vehicle size.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So there's no case in
20 which it would reduce the calculated minimum green light?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Correct. It just
22 changes W, which in effect is my minimum green, and then I
23 can extend it for the slow moving vehicle.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay. I'm with you.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I'm just

1 wondering what we would have done if the flights were not
2 canceled. Thank god for that.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That's what happened to
4 us last time, the flights weren't canceled and so we cut the
5 discussion short.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, weren't
7 canceled, so we shortened the discussion.

8 Okay. I think we had discussion enough on this,
9 except if you guys want one more round?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So, it may be used to
11 extend, not to adjust, right?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, adjust is the
13 word we want to use.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes, adjust.

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: CBAC's wants adjust.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Adjust gives them
17 the flexibility to do as needed. If you want to go with
18 extend or reduce, we get into a hairy area, I think.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Last call
21 for discussion. Any? Mr. Bahadori?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Are we, just to
23 understand, are we going to vote for this paragraph on page
24 four, which is the second paragraph from the bottom, to add
25 the green one?

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes, with the
2 change of the word "reduce" to "adjust".

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yes, okay. Very good.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So that's the
5 vote, that's the motion, that's the second. Hopefully no
6 more discussions. Any discussion before vote? Last call?

7 (No response.)

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, okay, let's
9 vote on this. All those in favor say aye?

10 (Ayes.)

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Opposition?

12 (No response.)

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Abstention?

14 (No response.)

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, the motion
16 passes unanimously.

17 Okay. Thank you.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: One of the things --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: We're going to
20 charge, you know, you're getting us a hotel room tonight, I
21 just want you to know.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: One of the things that
23 came out of the Bicycle Advisory Committee was the
24 recommendation that we reconvene the subcommittee to talk
25 about some of these other related timing issues, as the data

1 becomes available. So, you do have a choice of whether that
2 all comes back here with the data, or whether you -- they've
3 agreed to meet as part of the subcommittee to talk about
4 this away from --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. At this
6 point there's nothing for the subcommittee to do. Let's
7 wait for the Berkeley people to finish their study and then
8 Caltrans brings it back and says, okay, we have new
9 information. Okay. Again, new information can be pretty
10 much reaffirmation of what they already know, then with that
11 data this Committee didn't want to change anything. But, if
12 that data is different and presents new information, then
13 probably the Committee is going to decide to change
14 something, and then at that time you can form a subcommittee
15 if you want, and Mr. Fisher is going to start appointing
16 people.

17 Okay. Now, you want -- let's make it quick. Can
18 we make -- can we be back here at 4:15, the latest?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I think so.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you.

21 (Thereupon, at 4:05 p.m. the meeting
22 was recessed, to reconvene at 4:15 p.m.)

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Please, if I can
24 have your attention. Those that need to have conversation,
25 we appreciate it if you continue outside.

1 Just a little point, I just heard that all the
2 flights out of San Diego are canceled for tomorrow also.
3 That's what the Chief just shared with me. Is that as of
4 this afternoon, they're all canceled?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Except for the weekend.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, even for the
7 weekend. You know how they --

8 (Laughter.)

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, anybody who
10 wants to fly out of John Wayne Airport -- I can give you a
11 ride at a reasonable fee, you know.

12 (Laughter.)

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, we'll
14 go back to our agenda items.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Is he serious?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, I don't think
17 he's serious.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, no, I'm
19 serious, tomorrow, yeah, he just said tomorrow they are
20 canceled.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: The airlines called
22 back and canceled me off two flights tomorrow.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Oh, tomorrow.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Yeah, for tomorrow.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, tomorrow is

1 canceled, some of the flights. So, if you take Amtrak you
2 are going to make it to the Bay Area by Monday anyway, so.

3 Okay, back to agenda, we have Item 10-5, it's a
4 discussion item for When Children are Present (School Sign)
5 and it's a request by Caltrans, Mr. Henley.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. There's a school
7 up there, I think it's in the Redding area, that's right on
8 the edge of town -- Red Bluff, okay.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Red Bluff. Nice
10 area.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Anyway, basically what
12 it says is it's right at the edge of an urban area, people
13 go a lot faster than 25 miles an hour. And one of the
14 parents was, you know, was concerned about the speeds of the
15 vehicles so he said, well, you know, nobody understands that
16 "When Children are Present", because it's very complicated.
17 So, he -- so then he suggested, well, why don't you put a
18 flashing light above the speed limit sign, and maybe that
19 would get people's attention. Well, he did that, or you
20 know, we did that, and that's not getting people's
21 attention. So, we're looking for how can we make it more
22 obvious to the traveling public that when they're with, you
23 know, when they're within 500 feet of a school and there are
24 children present, and there's a speed limit of 25 with that
25 sign on it, that that's what they should go.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Can you hang a
2 child from the sign, so they see? I'm sorry.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: We're looking for
4 suggestions, because that's a defective --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Yeah,
6 that's okay. So, you're basically asking for any experience
7 that anyone has had or ideas?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah, experience or
9 ideas. Yeah, I mean, different wording, and --

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Yes,
11 Mr. Fisher?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Wayne, is the issue of
13 "When Children are Present" versus "When Flashing", is that
14 the issue?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No, there's a couple.
16 First, the law enforcement up there says that, you know,
17 they enforce it all day long, 7:00 o'clock in the morning
18 till 6:30 at night. But then that's apparently not doing
19 the trick. So, that's when they put the -- and of course
20 that's not in accordance of the law. The law says you only
21 enforce it when children are present. And of course if the
22 school doesn't have a fence and a playground, then you can
23 enforce it when the kids are out in recess. Of course in
24 this particular school the playground is on the back side of
25 the school so they're not anywhere near the state highway

1 but, still people are going too fast. And so then he said,
2 okay, let's do the flashing yellow light, and we
3 accommodated him and put a flashing yellow light. Although
4 there haven't been any accidents in the area, the flashing
5 yellow light had nothing to do with when the speed limit is
6 enforced or not enforced but some people feel it --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: It just calls attention
8 to the restriction when children are present.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Calls attention, yeah.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: The only thing I know
11 that we've done is we've put in speed feedback signs in the
12 school zone, so that you encounter the sign "School Speed
13 Limit 25 When Children are Present", and then we follow it
14 with "Your Speed Is".

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: That's a great idea.

16 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: That sign, is it
17 actually working 24 hours or just school time?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: We've been operating it
19 24 hours a day. We put them on our higher speed streets so
20 that we are reminding them of their speeds even outside of
21 the school hours.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well, they've got a
23 controller there that actually controls the light, you know,
24 turns it off and on before the school and after the school,
25 and I could see where that same controller could probably

1 turn on a speed limit.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, yeah, you could
3 elect to operate it during the general school hours of 7:00
4 to 4:00, whatever, or you could operate it 24/7, or you
5 could operate it only when speeds exceed a certain
6 threshold, there's all sorts of options that you have.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: We're going to
8 come to the public. Another thing, Mr. Henley, is just
9 usually when you want to improve the visibility of a sign,
10 there's always the LED option. I don't remember exactly
11 what our language is in our MUTCD, if it allows the use of
12 LED enhanced "When Children are Present" signs. We've made
13 some very serious restrictions on the use of LED on signs
14 but, if allowed to use LEDs, especially in the darker hours.

15 We are going to open it to public but, before we
16 go, any other members? Chief?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: They have those speed
18 feedback signs in the school signs up in Roseville, and I
19 think they're very effective. They only -- they are only
20 activated during certain times of the day, when it's
21 appropriate based on the school zone. But, it seems, Wayne,
22 that one of the issues here is that some member or members
23 of the community want the sign, the beacons, turned on for a
24 longer period of time during the day than they currently
25 are, right?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: They want them all day
2 long.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: And so even if one of
4 the mitigating measures was a speed feedback sign, which I
5 think would be very effective to get people's attention,
6 you're still going to have this issue of them thinking that
7 speed feedback signs should be going 24 hours a day, and if
8 you're talking about the school zone and only reducing the
9 speed when it's appropriate, based on the definition of a
10 school zone, you're still going to have that same fight on
11 your hands.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
13 thoughts from members before we go to the public?

14 Mr. Babico?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: One question I have is,
16 if the issue is that the driver doesn't pay attention to the
17 sign and they are over speeding, or something else?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I think it's people, you
19 know, people have been driving through the country and they
20 come to essentially the outskirts and the first thing they
21 come to is this school, and of course they're still going 55
22 or 45.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Right. Then why is 24
24 hours? I mean this is only during the school hours.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: It's not -- right now --

1 it's --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, I hear that you were
3 saying 24 hours.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No, I'm not saying 24
5 hours, I'm sorry, no.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Oh, I'm sorry.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
8 questions? Johnny, do you want to share something with us?

9 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. I think there might have been
10 some miscommunication in-house for us.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Johnny, introduce
12 yourself.

13 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans,
14 Director of California MUTCD. So, I think there might have
15 been some miscommunication in-house, because I do want to
16 point out Section 7B-11 of the California MUTCD, and
17 basically it strictly prohibits the use of "When Flashing"
18 plaque as well as the flashing beacons, and as part of the
19 message here in our current policy is that when "When
20 Flashing" and special time period messages shall not be used
21 in school areas in California as they are not supported by
22 CVC22-352. And for that very reason there are more support
23 language going in, "When Flashing" message is misleading
24 because it suggests that the speed limit is enforced only
25 when the flashing beacons are in operation. The speed of 25

1 is in effect based on the presence of children, per CVC22-
2 352. So, that's why, even in the City of Roseville I've
3 noticed that they have been using that speed feedback and
4 intuitively what they are trying to do is they are trying to
5 get on during the times when school is open, but what they
6 are, I think, training probably to the motorist is to pay
7 attention only when they're on, even though they're not
8 saying as much, and we might be misleading the motorist
9 because the next time, around 7:00 p.m., then when there are
10 kids around and you don't have it on, then it would violate
11 the CVC.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I hear you.

13 MR. BHULLAR: So, it's setting the wrong precedent
14 even in that particular case. So, I think we need to either
15 amend our California MUTCD before we do any other action, or
16 check with the Vehicle Code regarding that.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you.

18 Let's open it to the public. Oh, you have a question for
19 Johnny?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, one thing, a point
21 of information, probably five or ten years ago when Jennie
22 Meyers was here, this subject was brought to the meeting, to
23 the discussion but it was from the Caltrans legal point of
24 view, the interpretation of the "When Children are Present"
25 does not reflect, by wording, according to the California

1 Vehicle Code. So, I don't remember completely what happened
2 during that discussion.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I think the sign now
4 reflects the Vehicle Code exactly.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I understand -- well --
6 not verbatim, because one of the legal Caltrans legal was
7 interpreting or recommending lengthy language, because it
8 says to and from the school, and during the siesta or noon
9 time, blah, blah, blah.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I think, doesn't the law
11 say something about lunchtime, the lunch recess?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah, right. I remember
13 that probably Farhad remembers that.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I wasn't here at
15 that long ago. I'm one of the young guys.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Ah come on.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Because he got angry
18 at the older guys, so I'm one of the young guys.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Let's open
20 it to public. If any members of the public have any
21 thoughts they want to share on the item.

22 Yes, sir?

23 MR. MONROY: This might just be anecdotal but --
24 oh, I'm sorry -- Edgar Monroy, private citizen at this time.
25 The County of San Diego got a grant from OTS and they put

1 in five of these radar signs and it tells you how fast
2 you're going. And you can talk with Carl Shaffer at the
3 county right here. Six months later the speeds were back up
4 to where they were before. So, I mean that's just -- and he
5 has the data, he has to show OTS what happened with his
6 money and how it was spent and what happened. That's what
7 Carl tells me. Thank you.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: People always
9 drive safe speed that day, think it's safe further on. We
10 learn that over and over and over.

11 Okay, any other members of the public?

12 (No response.)

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Seeing none, back
14 to the Committee. So, you heard all the creative ideas.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Thank you.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You're welcome.
17 Okay. Good luck.

18 We go now to Item 10-6, that's a Proposal to
19 Restructure the California Traffic Control Devices
20 Committee, it's an item introduced by Caltrans.

21 Mr. Henley?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I'll go find Robert,
23 while you guys start.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: He needs to hear this.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Do you want, if

1 you want I can move to Item No. 9, Information Items, until
2 Robert comes.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Why don't we do
4 that, yeah.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let's go to Item
6 No. 9 until Mr. Copp joins us. Item No. 9 is Information
7 Item MUTCD 2009.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. You know, I'm
9 sure we all know that the Federal MUTCD, 2009 MUTCD is out,
10 and of course that begins another cycle for us, and it just
11 so happens that we just ended the last cycle, so this is
12 perfect timing. Now we'll be employed for at least another
13 two years, right.

14 Anyway, Johnny, do you want to explain, you know,
15 what it means and what we're going to be doing?

16 MR. BHULLAR: All right. Thanks, Wayne. I'm
17 Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.

18 Basically, first of all I do want to update
19 everyone here regarding the Revision 2 of the 2003 MUTCD
20 that we were currently working under, and that at the last
21 meeting we had been given the go ahead. And we were going
22 to finalize it. Tomorrow is the drop dead date but because
23 of change in horses (sic, phonetic) for the FHWA side, we
24 have had some issues that have come up in the last two or
25 three weeks that were not brought to our attention earlier,

1 something like 37 page comments that were submitted to us on
2 December 22nd, that we had to wrestle with. So, in short,
3 we have basically worked on those and reconciled them as of
4 like ten minutes ago while I was stepping outside and
5 talking to Steve Byburn (phonetic), no joking. I mean
6 that's how we are operating on this one. So, I been now
7 given the go ahead, so tomorrow morning we will be issuing
8 the California MUTCD revision. The current one that we have
9 is September 26, 2006, so tomorrow we will be issuing the
10 update to that.

11 So, having said that, of course as most of you are
12 familiar, December 16th is when the Feds came out with the
13 2009 MUTCD and it takes effect on December -- January 15,
14 2010 for all states that have it as a normal charter, to
15 have it adopted as is. For our state, as a number of other
16 states, we are given two years and for that we have until
17 January 15, 2012 to adopt this new 2009 MUTCD. And for
18 those of you who have had time to look at it, of course it
19 has a number of new signs, new policies, new devices, the
20 look, feel and also the formatting has been changed
21 completely. So, that's the one that we are going to
22 undertake.

23 And what I'm going to at least ask the Committee
24 today is that having now starting on a new process, what I
25 want to seek from the Committee is that this time around how

1 are we going to approach it? I have a few suggestions which
2 I'm going to throw out before we begin, and then I'm going
3 to let the Committee decide, and at least give us direction
4 in California how we are going to approach it this time
5 around, because it's a new manual, new formatting, new style
6 but, at the same time it has gone through extensive, I would
7 say discussion at the national level, and we have been also
8 exposed to it because most of it was issued as though there
9 was proposed amendments, as of last year. So, it has been a
10 year and a half it has already been out. So, it's not that
11 this time around, it's not like California is not being hit
12 cold with it for the first time, so we have had about a year
13 and a half, at least, through the notice of proposed
14 amendments, to take a look at it. So, I do not envision
15 this time we should take two years and go through the full
16 cycle and then adopt it, because it's a new manual but a lot
17 of things we have been exposed to it, we can probably work a
18 little bit quicker this time and hopefully my goal is if we
19 can just do that within this year, and of course by saying
20 that I don't mean to rush into it but, what I propose is a
21 series of workshops like we had done the last time around,
22 on different topics, and those workshops can be either set
23 one north, one south, or however we want to approach it.
24 But, in those workshops all we are going to discuss is not
25 the entire changes, if I'm given the liberty to, what I will

1 do is I will prepare the material in advance, in the sense
2 that some of the things that the Feds do not even allow us
3 to touch, meaning the "shalls" that are newly proposed, why
4 even go through the exercise of discussing it if we don't
5 have that right to look at those. So, if we can just look
6 at the things that we were allowed the flexibility to change
7 or modify, so if I can narrow down that list it will make
8 the work easier for us, and have some workshops and try to
9 do it a little bit at a quicker pace, that's my hope. But,
10 of course I'll let the Committee decide how we approach this
11 time around.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Johnny, I heard
13 that there were like about five thousand comments only from
14 California to the National, probably a lot of them were
15 repetitive and duplication but still substantial amounts.

16 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah, there were over 15,000 to
17 19,000 comments that were total, yeah.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Nationally, yeah,
19 and 5,000 I think were from California.

20 Mr. Babico?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. My understanding
22 is that the National MUTCD is available and it's been
23 revised, at the same time we have California MUTCD is
24 changed but we haven't seen it yet. So, there are two
25 documents, two of them to the panel, we haven't reviewed or

1 seen them yet but, to please the California MUTCD it's only
2 a revision. We have seen up to date, except whatever is
3 coming from tomorrow and on, what you -- are you going to
4 publish it in the website, Caltrans website?

5 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, the California MUTCD update,
6 basically the Committee has seen it. And we had gone
7 through the open public comment period from July through
8 September 22nd, so there shouldn't be any surprises there.
9 All we did was just to do some cleanups and other stuff but,
10 most of the stuff has gone through this Committee, so
11 there's nothing new. Whatever the Committee has recommended
12 since September 26, 2006, about 40 items, those are the ones
13 that are included in my update that we will be issuing
14 tomorrow, and it will be posted online tomorrow.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay but --

16 MR. BHULLAR: So, that shouldn't be new.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I remember when you
18 asked us for any comments, we sent the comments.

19 MR. BHULLAR: That's correct.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But we haven't seen
21 them. Whether how, what format, was included, or they were
22 not included.

23 MR. BHULLAR: Well, we had shared with everyone,
24 and it's currently even today, it has been posted online and
25 the red color text version we showed how we were addressing

1 those comments.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay.

3 MR. BHULLAR: So, it has been there.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. Let's assume that
5 we will have those and we will finalize it at this one step.

6 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, that's correct.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: And then we have to look
8 on the Federal version and then match the two to see how we
9 are going to agree with the two documents.

10 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. Basically the way, if you want
11 to approach it as today, as of today, standing here, the
12 September 26, 2006 version of the California MUTCD is the
13 official version in California. Tomorrow, once I issue the
14 update, that becomes the official manual in our state. The
15 MUTCD 2009 is in the background, it does not become
16 applicable in our state until this Committee and Caltrans
17 takes action. So, that's what we are going to be working on
18 throughout the year, going through that exercise to see
19 which one of those changes are okay for California and which
20 ones are not, and working with that flexibility. But,
21 that's, the MUTCD 2009 has no bearing or applicability
22 currently as of this moment in California. It is not until
23 we act on it.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. But, are we going
25 to adopt that, tomorrow's California MUTCD or it's a given?

1 MR. BHULLAR: No, for tomorrow's California MUTCD
2 update is only going to include what we had already worked
3 through our previous meetings, so that's all it's going to
4 include. I'm not touching the MUTCD 2009 at all, that's up
5 to the Committee throughout the year to go through these
6 workshops and make those decisions.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: The one that is
8 going to get on the website tomorrow pretty much includes
9 all those 40 things that Johnny said that we have been going
10 through for the last two years, three years, whatever.

11 Mr. Fisher?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: As incoming Chair, I
13 would like to set the goal, and I agree with you, of posting
14 the 2010 California MUTCD no later than the end of December.

15 I think we should set that as a goal. And I think we've
16 been through this a couple of times, and I think we get
17 better at it every time we go through it. I would like for
18 us not only to review the new "shalls" and "shoulds" in the
19 MUTCD but, I'd also like us just to take a second look at
20 the current "shalls" and "shoulds", and there aren't many
21 but there are a few that are in deviation with the MUTCD
22 currently. Just to make sure we still want to be there.

23 MR. BHULLAR: That's a very good point, because we
24 had promised the Feds, the last time around, even though we
25 got grandfathered in with a lot of the "shall" and the

1 "should" violations of the National MUTCD, we did promise at
2 that time that we will, over time, take a look at them and
3 see if, whenever the time comes, if we can change them, yes.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: And also along the way
5 we adopt small changes in language that enhance what we have
6 but it doesn't rise to the level of importance where we have
7 to issue a directive. For example, what we just approved
8 for bicycle timing. And I think that would be the time to
9 incorporate all those small changes that have occurred along
10 the way, include those as we review the National MUTCD.

11 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah, but John, up to today,
12 whatever even at today's meeting is being recommended, I'm
13 going to be putting that into the memo tomorrow?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: That's going to be in
15 there tomorrow.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, tomorrow.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Oh, okay.

18 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, yes, so we are moving at a
19 faster pace. I already --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Tomorrow's document will
21 be our starting point.

22 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, because I don't know if you
23 noticed or not but, during the break I had already shown to
24 Jacob the sign that was proposed this morning, I had
25 Jennifer do the sketch and also include that in the figure,

1 and she already showed it to Steve Byburn (phonetic) of FHWA
2 and they agreed, and Jacob agreed, so that was in. And I
3 got the language from Jeff, I'm going to put that in. So,
4 tomorrow at least we'll be starting from that day onward,
5 only new stuff.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's why he was
7 trying to sell us that last quarter after lunch. I told you
8 he wanted to get it in the manual tomorrow.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Thank goodness they --

10 MR. BHULLAR: To me, it's self-serving because it
11 starts with a clean slate.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, thank goodness
13 they canceled our flights and we can do all that.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Very good. But
15 the goal that you set, as an incoming Chairman, that's going
16 to affect Item No. 11 now, on the two or three meetings this
17 year you're not going to be able to achieve that.

18 One other thing on the workshops that you
19 mentioned is that it was my experience, for the last four,
20 five years, workshops are only effective if all members show
21 up. Otherwise, if you're missing two members, I don't
22 really see a whole lot of benefit, because then we have to
23 re-discuss the item all over again and you are going to
24 bring new comments and all that. It's not that effective.

25 MR. BHULLAR: To me not only am I looking at the

1 workshop for the members, actually for example for bicycle
2 or for other topics, when we are going to be looking at Part
3 9, we, in the workshops want technical people. So, for the
4 voting yes, it's going to come to the Committee for all
5 those changes but, for the technical side, Caltrans being a
6 State Highway Agency, we lack the expertise of the local
7 angle, so in these workshops we don't want to have only the
8 cities represented here but if somehow we can make it that
9 other cities and their engineers will meet some of these --

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And that's going
11 to be up to you to get the word out, tell the right people.

12 But what I'm saying is --

13 MR. BHULLAR: Well, we will be going through SHSP
14 or some other avenues to gather some of these people.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: But what I'm
16 saying is that the last four or five years some of these
17 workshops were used and there were only three of us. And
18 then the item would come back the next day, and usually the
19 workshop was the day before the meeting, and the next day we
20 had to spend two hours already on the item in the Committee
21 meeting, we would spend another two hours because the other
22 five members were not there. So, what was the point of
23 having a workshop? So, that's what I'm saying.

24 Chief? Are you set?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Nothing yet

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Knowles and
2 Mr. Mansourian?

3 (No response.)

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, with
5 that, our incoming Chairman already set the goad of end of
6 2010, which means on Item No. 11 you need to start
7 scheduling a whole bunch of meetings and workshops very
8 soon.

9 MR. BHULLAR: That's what I'm going to look for
10 the Committee, when you're setting up the meeting dates for
11 the regular meetings, if somehow -- I'm not saying tie the
12 workshops to that but, I want the Committee to decide those
13 workshop dates for us and we'll try to make those dates.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And if we can
15 make those dates very early on, so people can schedule
16 throughout the year, so that you put it on some kind of
17 frequent basis, like second Wednesday of every other month
18 or whatever that's supposed to be, decide how many you want,
19 so people can start blocking time on their calendars, so we
20 actually get members coming to workshops. Otherwise they're
21 not really productive because, when you bring the item back
22 here, all over again, it gets --

23 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I will suggest, you
24 know, Johnny can do his own work -- and the next meeting you
25 figure out when we're going to do workshops. So, you need

1 to --

2 MR. BHULLAR: By next meeting we are going to lose
3 probably three or four months already from the 12 month goal
4 that we have, so what I'm going to suggest is probably if
5 either today we can come up with some schedule or, if not,
6 then within a week or two we can, through email exchanges,
7 start setting up the workshops.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let's discuss it
9 when we get to Item No. 11 next meeting.

10 Mr. Mansourian?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I just wanted to ask
12 Johnny how many workshops do you think we need in 2010, in
13 the next 12 months?

14 MR. BHULLAR: Well, I think the way we will do the
15 workshops is topic wise, not like number of workshops,
16 because each topic is going to require different people
17 coming in. For example, on signals, in the signs workshop,
18 we don't want signals people and in the signals workshop we
19 don't want the sign people. So, depending upon the topics,
20 there are about eight topics that I notice, broad topics in
21 the California MUTCD, so that's a given that we need
22 workshops, of course different entities coming into those
23 workshops.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: But everyone in the
25 Committee should be there. Hamid is suggesting that

1 Committee members attend all.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I'm saying that
3 my experience, the adoption of the last MUTCD, we had a
4 workshop the day before the devices committee. Of the eight
5 members, only three members would go to the workshop. Then
6 when the item comes to the Committee --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, I understand
8 that.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- we
10 re-discussed the whole thing all over. So, it's not
11 productive.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Correct. But I'm
13 saying if you're suggesting that we go to all the workshops,
14 because that's a technical workshop that they haven't
15 wrestled down the problems, the issues, I'm for you guys
16 meeting, and then you come to us on a special -- let's set
17 aside two hours, three hours of the presentation on Chapter
18 X, that one should be we make a commitment to be mandatory
19 for all of us but, let them hash through it and my
20 suggestion is because when I was chairman I was attending
21 all the workshops, most of you wouldn't come because we
22 called it workshop. I think if we make it part of like a
23 two hour part of our agenda --

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Or maybe two day
25 meeting.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Or a two day
2 meeting, then it's --

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Don't even call
4 it a workshop, make it a --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: -- as long as we
6 don't meet in Sacramento -- I mean San Diego, I think we --
7 we want to go somewhere safe now.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Don't even call
9 it a workshop, call it a two day meeting. Dedicate one day
10 to that specific chapter or issue, and the next day go to
11 our regular agenda.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yeah, it's a
13 meeting.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yeah, but the first part
15 would not be public.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Open to the public.

18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: There is going to be,
19 then there is discussion on 2009 MUTCD, if someone want to
20 participate from public, they can.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Well, but it's not an
22 open --

23 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Okay.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: -- Brown Act meeting,
25 right.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Anytime you have
2 more than four members of this Committee discussing
3 anything, it's a Brown Act.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: No, but we aren't
5 deciding anything.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Still you have a
7 meeting and you are discussing agenda items that they're
8 going to make to the agenda, that's Brown Act.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: We're receiving a
10 report from the subcommittee on signals, a two hour session
11 let's say, here is the recommendation, we take public
12 testimony, we talk about it and we're done.

13 MR. BHULLAR: Actually that's a very good idea.
14 Why don't we do this in a way that I have like eight groups
15 that I can -- or eight topics that I can think of, and we
16 could subcommittees on each of those eight topics, and of
17 course you can assign some members on each of those
18 subcommittees, but all members don't have to be on each of
19 the subcommittees. And of course I'll also solicit the
20 technical from local agencies as well as Caltrans on each of
21 those subcommittees, and that's how we can work and put it
22 together.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yeah, but is it a
24 working meeting or is it a public meeting?

25 MR. BHULLAR: It will be a working meeting, it

1 will be a working technical meeting, not a public meeting.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Okay.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Theirs will be
4 technical, ours will be a committee meeting.

5 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Then we will have two
7 day meeting, the first day we'll just discuss that 2009
8 MUTCD.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Either one and a
10 half or two days, depends on how many of those subcommittees
11 are ready to give us their presentation in a public forum.

12 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Okay.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: We'll discuss it
14 more when we get to Item No. 11. Anything else on this?

15 (No response.)

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No. Okay, thank
17 you. Now, Zahir, go on.

18 MR. ZABIR: I just want to --

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Come to the
20 podium. Sorry, you have to come introduce yourself so that
21 he can record it.

22 MR. ZABIR: Zahir (indiscernible) City of Poway.
23 I just wanted to add that the FHWA has issued a CD that has
24 the 2009 manuals, it has the Power Point presentation, it
25 has the difference between the 2003 and the 2009, and it

1 also has the register that tells you why they took those
2 actions. So, this is probably a good thing to start with.

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Are you handing them
4 out for free?

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I was going to
6 say, is that a bootleg copy or you just bought it?

7 (Laughter.)

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: They charge a lot
9 of money, that's expensive. Okay. Anything else?

10 (No response.)

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Moving on,
12 we go back to now Item 10-6 and we're waiting for Mr. Copp
13 to come back to the room. It's a Proposal to Restructure
14 the Device Committee, and Mr. Henley.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. Well, I think it
16 was at the last meeting, you know, there was a suggestion
17 that we change or add some representation for I know at
18 least the bicycles, to the Committee. And so I think we
19 asked the bicycle group to, okay, give us, you know, a
20 decision document or a formal proposal. And in the last few
21 months they've put together a formal proposal and they've
22 signed it, and they sent it to us. And they are recommended
23 that they have basically a representative from two different
24 agencies, two different bicycle groups, I think is the way
25 it works. So, we have a decision to that document, it's

1 page 79 of 80. And the question is, what do we want to do
2 about it at this point?

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's the extent
4 of your presentation?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: That's the extent of my
6 presentation.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You have no Power
8 Point?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No Power Point.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: How about you,
11 Mr. Copp, do you have anything to add at this point or do
12 you want to wait to hear from the Committee?

13 MR. COPP: Yeah, I'd like to hear from the
14 Committee.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, you
16 heard the proposal from Caltrans, you have read the letter
17 that's in your packet, page 79. We'll start from
18 Mr. Mansourian.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Are you doing this
20 public? Are you taking public --

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any item that's
22 on the agenda has to go to public.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, that's what I'm
24 saying. I'll wait after I hear public.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: By the way, I want you

1 to know that this is -- I'm not going to say it's Caltrans'
2 proposal, this is a proposal from CBAC.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: That's why I'm
5 saying I would like to hear from the public.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Sure. Okay.

7 Mr. Knowles, do you want to wait or do you want
8 to make comments?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'll wait.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Chief?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I'll wait.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: John?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: I'll wait.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You guys back
15 there, the guys on the far left? Okay. So, we open it to
16 the public at this point and Jim.

17 MR. BAROSS: I'm Jim Baross, and at this point
18 representing the California Bicycle Advisory Committee, and
19 in a moment I'll represent the two organizations down there.
20 I'm in favor.

21 (Laughter.)

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's the kind
23 of presentation I like, get to the point without the
24 hyperbole.

25 MR. BAROSS: Yes, well it is almost 5:00 and you

1 guys are going to be here for three days so maybe --

2 I think you can read it. We think that the CTCDC
3 originally started with the responsibilities of the
4 Automobile Association, it's appropriately formatted except
5 that it's not as representative as we think it should be for
6 the legally allowed road users. So, we are asking for two
7 positions representing each of the statewide bicycling
8 organizations, which consist of the California Association
9 of Bicycling Organizations, which was formed in the late
10 seventies, I'm the President of that organization, and the
11 other organization is the California Bicycle Coalition,
12 formed in I think early nineties, I'm not sure of the exact
13 date, I'm on the Executive Board of that Committee or that
14 organization. Both organizations have been very active,
15 both of them tried to provide broad representation across
16 the state, although they have slightly different approaches
17 to that, but they do, in all cases, promote safe, legal and
18 courteous cycling. And I think you've seen, over the last
19 couple of years, presentations by representatives of either
20 or both organizations, and I think we've established
21 ourselves as being able to provide support, technical advice
22 and good representation of bicycling.

23 I should mention that, I think it was two weeks
24 ago, I was successfully able to have Senator Kehoe's
25 assistance in convening a task force, or at least a progeny,

1 a start of a task force, where we were trying to get her
2 support and the support of many agencies in the state for
3 reconvening the statewide Bicycling Committee which was
4 active in the 1970s, resulting of which was the bike lane
5 laws, several changes to the California Vehicle Code, and a
6 couple other things I can't remember at the moment. At that
7 meeting I had asked Senator Kehoe, and my understanding is
8 the Caltrans Director, were supportive of our request,
9 although not being specific about who or how many, and I
10 think there was a letter sent to CTCDC from Senator Kehoe
11 supporting that request.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That letter was
13 shared with all the members.

14 MR. BAROSS: Great. So, I'm available for
15 questions but, I think I've stated what we're up to.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any questions?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Mr. Chairman, I have
18 questions.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Farhad.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I have a question,
21 and I hope I can package it so I don't come across wrong.
22 The organizations that you represent, if I would say you're
23 an advocate group, is that the right way of saying it?

24 MR. BAROSS: It's fair. Let me see where you're
25 going with it.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Right. Because I
2 want to put this -- really this is a question that I want to
3 understand.

4 MR. BAROSS: Yes, certainly.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So, if Caltrans
6 opens up the Committee to for one advocate group, then how
7 would us, so you're now sitting here with us, the two of
8 you, how would we then not to say two for transit, two for
9 trucking industry and two for ADA and so on, and so on, and
10 so on, and you know, that's the part -- we have a Committee
11 somewhere around here that has 250 members, it's actually in
12 your statement, you say that.

13 MR. BAROSS: The National.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Correct. So, the
15 biggest issue I have, other than your problem statement that
16 I am not fully agreed on yet, you need to convince me of
17 that, but I don't know how would then we be not responsive
18 to other advocates, because the transit guys can come and
19 say the same thing, and the ADA guys actually we've had this
20 request. Just so you know our history, also the
21 manufacturer groups came and said, you guys are behind
22 technology and you're not approving things, and we need, you
23 know, so on and so forth. So, I would appreciate hearing.
24 Remember, you're now sitting with us, right, because we've
25 agreed with this along with Caltrans Director, now we've got

1 all these other issues. How do we say no to them, or maybe
2 we shouldn't say no to them?

3 MR. BAROSS: Well, first off, as much as you all
4 enjoy my participation, it probably won't be me that's set
5 forward as a -- I don't feel I have the technical expertise.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So that's the end
7 of the end discussion.

8 MR. BAROSS: Yeah, exactly.

9 (Laughter.)

10 MR. BAROSS: Although we don't know that. There's
11 two approaches to your question. One addressing that a
12 particular user group should or shouldn't be a member. If
13 you are going to deny or decide that particular user groups
14 shouldn't have membership, then I think the AAA
15 representatives should bow out. That's the most confrontive
16 response.

17 The other is that it's somewhat, and I don't mean
18 this as, well, it's going to come across as a threat, I do
19 have support from Legislatures for getting representation
20 for bicyclists, and my understanding is at least one of the
21 advocates, who I don't control, is trying to get a
22 Legislature to put in Legislation to expand the
23 representation of the group. That request will probably be
24 very expensive.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: By the way, you

1 understand that anything that's proposed in Sacramento, it
2 doesn't mean that it passes. It's just a proposed
3 Legislation.

4 MR. BAROSS: I've heard that. Actually I've had
5 several --

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: About 3,500
7 pieces are proposed every year, 900 passes.

8 MR. BAROSS: Yes, yes, but I --

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Just for
10 clarification, because you said you don't want to threaten.

11 MR. BAROSS: Yes. I think that one way to head
12 off the potential of that kind of expansion, if you don't
13 think it's appropriate, is to make some movements towards
14 getting wider participation.

15 One of the staff members for Senator Kehoe, when I
16 told him about this potential, said, well, can't the
17 argument be made that the roadway, the highway, has a
18 limited number of legal users of the roadway, that is
19 bicyclists, motor vehicle operators, actually equestrians
20 and then the rest of them are crossing but not as big a part
21 of traffic. I don't know if that argument stands or not,
22 so I'm going to say from my personal perspective, I would
23 prefer to have representation on this Committee for
24 bicyclists and if it was expanded, I think my, our clout
25 would be reduced, you know, would be diluted, so just as

1 with AAA probably wanting to keep their two out of eight
2 memberships, I would not stand in the way but prefer that
3 there were bicycling representatives and not transit,
4 equestrians, skateboarders and what else.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: By the way, you
6 made a statement assuming facts not in evidence that AAA has
7 a position on this issue. And I would just like to correct
8 you on that.

9 MR. BAROSS: You don't have two?

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, but you
11 said that AAA wants to stand in the way of this.

12 MR. BAROSS: Oh, oh, I'm sorry.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's not,
14 that's not -- I appreciate if you speak for organization
15 that you can represent only.

16 MR. BAROSS: I'm sorry, I apologize.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I'm sorry, I just
18 need to make sure. So, if you, not you but we're using you
19 as an example, if the two organizations would be joining us,
20 then additional advocacy groups wanted to come for a variety
21 of good reasons, then you would not be supporting it?

22 MR. BAROSS: I can't answer that.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I think what's
24 he's saying is that -- I think what Mr. Mansourian is asking
25 is that if next year this time we have eight additional

1 organizations each asking, using the same logic with two
2 representation, with 16 additional members coming to
3 Committee, and by that time you are a member of this
4 Committee, will you support the addition of those 16 new
5 members?

6 MR. BAROSS: I think it would depend on the
7 groups. I think it would depend on the groups.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And what will
9 your criteria be?

10 MR. BAROSS: Skateboarders are not legal users of
11 the roadway.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's not --

13 MR. BAROSS: Legal users of the roadway.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, do you
15 suggest some criteria for consideration?

16 MR. BAROSS: Yes.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: What would those
18 criteria should be?

19 MR. BAROSS: I think legal users of the roadway.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Which is the
21 examples that Mr. Mansourian mentioned.

22 MR. BAROSS: I think a roadway excludes
23 pedestrians, except as crossing.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, the examples
25 like transit, like ADA, --

1 MR. BAROSS: The highway -- includes, off the top
2 of my head, I hadn't broached it.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Thank you, I was
5 just --

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Any other
7 questions for Jim here?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: I have a question.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Ms. Wong?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: You mentioned the
11 Statewide Bicycle Committee that's being reconvened and then
12 there's the California Bicycle Advisory Committee, are those
13 two different advisory committees?

14 MR. BAROSS: Yes.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: State advisory

16 MR. BAROSS: There's a California Bicycle Advisory
17 Committee, which recommends to Caltrans, it's made up of
18 approximately 12 members, and I can't rattle them off. The
19 Statewide Bicycling Task Force, which is in its infancy and
20 is apparently CHP is taking some leadership role in setting
21 up the next meeting, the membership of that is going to be,
22 as I understand it, flexible based on issues, and would be
23 developing responses to issues that are raised but wouldn't
24 be beholding to, or a Committee of Caltrans.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Okay. Is that more of a

1 temporary?

2 MR. BAROSS: I hope it's temporary. I've got too
3 many meetings right now.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: It's task based. Okay.
5 And then the Advisory Committee is a standing Committee?

6 MR. BAROSS: Yes.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: It sounds like it has a
8 similar role to this group.

9 MR. BAROSS: Yep.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: But it's specifically
11 addressing bicycle issues on the road.

12 MR. BAROSS: Yes. And paths, yeah.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Right.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: I guess my question
16 would be, you know, I'm glad that Caltrans seeks the advice
17 of the bicycle users in the State of California and has
18 established the Bicycle Advisory Group. Given that, why do
19 you think then you would need to be involved in another
20 advisory group that advises on traffic control, since you
21 would be addressing that as part of the Statewide Bicycle
22 Advisory Committee?

23 MR. BAROSS: Let me respond by talking about some
24 recent history. This isn't a new request or a new interest
25 on the part of bicyclists. And I don't know when we first

1 contacted Devinder and Caltrans about this opportunity.
2 But, CBAC and the Bicycling Organizations realized that this
3 organization, this Committee, really is the top of the heap
4 controlling body as far as providing recommendations to
5 Caltrans.

6 When we asked for representation on this Committee
7 it was discussed and decided, not a written but a mutual
8 agreement, that we would try a system by which the CTCDC
9 would refer bicycling related issues to CBAC prior to your
10 discussion of those items. There was to be a year long
11 process, which has passed as of October, I think it was,
12 during that year there was, like the NEV, NEV bike lane
13 issues that was addressed at Lincoln, that was brought to
14 CBAC and we provided some representation. You may recall I
15 provided testimony on the back of CBAC. However, it's been
16 our perception, and I don't have the documentation, that
17 issues related to bicycling that we thought, and still
18 think, should have come to CBAC first, never hit us.
19 Primarily those items related to experimental experiments,
20 for instance the Long Beach green lanes down the center came
21 to you first -- actually it went to FHWA first and then came
22 to you. It was a big surprise to us. The issue of -- well
23 -- there were other issues as well. And, when an issue even
24 had previously come to CBAC and CBAC had deliberated for
25 hours or whatever it takes, and come to a conclusion and

1 recommendation and brought that forward, the only way to get
2 that information to you was through public comment. In
3 other words, we weren't a member of your group. And the
4 organization and the format of your deliberations are that
5 there's an issue brought, public comment, and then you do
6 your discussions. During those discussions, I, several
7 times, it's all I could do to keep from jumping up and, you
8 know, my -- it was of course my perception, my belief, that
9 some of the arguably facts or perceptions presented by Board
10 members were not the same as my understanding of what either
11 the California Vehicle Code is or, in my particular area of
12 expertise what the appropriate behavior of bicyclists in
13 traffic should be. I'm a bicycling instructor/trainer for
14 the League of American Bicyclists, we train bicyclists to
15 help them be capable and legal courteous operators on the
16 roadway, and I think I have some level of expertise that I
17 suspect those of you, even though you ride bicycles, haven't
18 any certified or actual experience comparable to what could
19 be provided by those two organizations.

20 So, getting back to your question, CBAC has a
21 role, and I think in the future that role, when there's
22 representation here for bicyclists, is to spend the time
23 necessary, like with San Luis Obispo's issue with their
24 particular intersection. If we'd had more time and we could
25 spend the hours it takes with the expertise available on

1 that Committee, to then bring forward to you something that
2 we think would work, it would be less work for you in other
3 words, and participation as a member on this Committee
4 allows for more opportunities to interact, to provide the
5 bicyclist perspective.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
7 questions, Mr. Fisher?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yeah, I just find that a
9 little bit surprising, looking at what happened today. We
10 spent many hours on an issue of bicycle timing, heard all
11 different perspectives, sought the advice of researchers at
12 U.C. Berkeley, setup a bicycle task force to look at this
13 issue and deliberated quite some time on it, only to come
14 away with the conclusion that we needed to install bicycle
15 detectors and provide adequate bicycle timing.

16 I would think one would argue then that that
17 system works but, again, we only advise Caltrans. And you
18 advise Caltrans. And Caltrans issues the directive. So if
19 the opinion of the Bicycle Advisory Committee is not being
20 sought, we think it's Caltrans' responsibility to seek your
21 advice. We advise them, you advise them, they have to come
22 to a decision. I don't know that it's our role to schedule
23 something that's on your agenda on your agenda, because
24 Caltrans is the coordinator of it all.

25 MR. BAROSS: So, bicycling issues don't need to be

1 heard here because they could be taken care of at CBAC?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: No, I didn't say that.
3 I'm saying, while we have a perspective from the agency
4 perspective, Caltrans I think intends, and should be seeking
5 your advice before issuing a directive on something that
6 affects bicyclists. And that's currently allowed under the
7 current system where you are an advisory committee.

8 MR. BAROSS: It sounds reasonable to me, except
9 that the obvious to me hierarchy of recommending bodies puts
10 your far above CBAC. We've brought recommendations forward,
11 for instance the use of Sharros, other things that have
12 taken quite awhile to get through this organization after
13 they've been approved at CBAC. My perception --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: But they were approved,
15 the first state in California, to approve them.

16 MR. BAROSS: Oh yeah.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: The first state in the
18 Nation to approve them.

19 MR. BAROSS: We've made great strides, we're just
20 trying to go faster.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Any other
22 questions? I have a couple quick questions.

23 Since you mentioned yourself that you're going to
24 look at some criteria in case there's future membership
25 requests and all that, I appreciate it if you share with the

1 members, you have two organizations here that are making the
2 request, California Association of Bicycling Organizations,
3 and California Bicycle Coalition.

4 MR. BAROSS: Correct.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: If you please
6 share with us the three pieces of information about each of
7 those organizations, one is the year that they were
8 established, the total number of registered members in each
9 organization, and what type of organizations are they? Are
10 they --

11 MR. BAROSS: They're incorporated 501(c)3 and 4.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: 501(c). And the
13 year of establishment of each of those organizations?

14 MR. BAROSS: I don't have an exact but I could get
15 you exact.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Ballpark?

17 MR. BAROSS: Late -- mid seventies for California
18 Association --

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And the number of
20 membership in each organization?

21 MR. BAROSS: That's more difficult because the
22 CABO, the California Association of Bicycling Organizations
23 has member organizations who have members, bicycle clubs and
24 advocacy groups. So --

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: These are dues

1 paying members.

2 MR. BAROSS: Yes, sir.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And how much, how
4 many?

5 MR. BAROSS: I'd say over 100 for each of them
6 certainly.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Each organization
8 has over 100,000?

9 MR. BAROSS: No, one hundred.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: One hundred
11 individuals?

12 MR. BAROSS: Organizational members in the form of
13 CABO and individuals from CBC are far over --

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, the two
15 organizations combined represent 200 people in the State of
16 California?

17 MR. BAROSS: No. The two organizations represent
18 all bicyclists in California, just as the AAA purports to
19 represent, I suspect, represents motorists.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, we never say
21 we represent motorists, we only represent 10.5 million
22 members.

23 MR. BAROSS: Okay.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: But, between
25 these two organizations, all I want to know is how many

1 members these organizations actually have, because you said
2 you are going to be looking at some criteria in the future.

3 MR. BAROSS: Criteria --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, if I go and I
5 start an advocacy group and it's only myself and two other
6 people, when I come to the Devices Committee, what are we
7 looking at, what are the thresholds? If I form an Advanced
8 Transportation System Management, call myself ATSM
9 organization, and there are only three of us, is that what
10 Caltrans needs to take into consideration? That's what I'm
11 trying to see, how many members does your organizations,
12 dues paying members they have.

13 MR. BAROSS: I don't have that information.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Is that something
15 that Caltrans can share with us, that you share with
16 Caltrans?

17 MR. BAROSS: I can certainly share it.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Because if you're
19 incorporated and you are filing taxes, so you have got a
20 number of registered, and how much you collected in terms of
21 membership dues and all that, that's information that's
22 readily available.

23 MR. BAROSS: Yes.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.
25 Any other questions for Jim?

1 (No response.)

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you. Do
3 you have something else to add?

4 MR. BAROSS: I wasn't going to present this,
5 unless you decided that only one representative was
6 appropriate for bicyclists, and --

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, why did you
8 decide two?

9 MR. BAROSS: We decided two because there's two
10 statewide organizations.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

12 MR. BAROSS: All right. That's easier to do with
13 the two statewide but, if you decided, if you decided two
14 was not appropriate and one was appropriate, I would
15 recommend that CBAC, the California Bicycle Advisor
16 Committee, provide the representation that we think is
17 appropriate for bicyclists.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you
19 very much for your time. Next person, I think I saw Dave
20 standing, and then I'll come to Zabir.

21 MR. ROSEMAN: I'll be short. Dave Roseman, City
22 of Long Beach. I think I've been to most meetings over the
23 last three years and sat out there --

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: We appreciate
25 that.

1 MR. ROSEMAN: And I think this Committee works
2 fine the way it is. If anything, I would like to see an
3 additional local law enforcement representative rather than
4 just the CHP. However, I think that the Committee is one
5 that works well and listening to all items. Today's agenda
6 is a prime example. We spent the vast majority of time on
7 bicycle issues. I think not everybody got exactly what they
8 wanted but it was a fair discussion of everything. And it's
9 the same with transit. As I stand here representing the
10 City of Long Beach, I represent all of those modes. And I
11 take some offense to not including pedestrians in some of
12 the comments of the previous speaker, because they are on
13 the public right of way, and we do have signs related to
14 pedestrians and we must keep them safe. Just because
15 somebody uses the roadway doesn't mean that they're not part
16 of that, your responsibility in Traffic Control Devices.
17 So, I think the Committee is efficient in the way that it
18 operates, having been here, and if you add members the
19 discussions will become longer and more difficult to get to
20 a resolution.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you for
22 sharing your views.

23 Sabir?

24 MR. ZABIR: Sabir (indiscernible) City of Poway.
25 I was thinking to get over that issue of other organization

1 comes tomorrow and what do you do. Maybe if you make your
2 model the same as the National Committee models, and you say
3 okay, bicyclists is part of the Committee and transit is,
4 pedestrian is not. So, if you take as a bigger umbrella,
5 the policy is that yeah, we do, you know, want the transit
6 and the bicyclists, maybe that you get over that issue, what
7 about representing bicycles, just an idea. So, it's --
8 whatever it's worth.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you. I
10 know you're very active at the National level and thank you
11 for sharing that. Anybody else who wants to share their
12 suggestions, their views, their recommendations with the
13 Committee on this issue?

14 (No response.)

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Seeing none, I
16 close it, bring it back to the Committee. Let's start with
17 the right side, Mr. Mansourian, you wanted to wait to hear.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I believe also --
19 Robert, do you have anything or you just want to hear us?

20 MR. COPP: I have a few things, do you want me to
21 go now or --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Please, if you don't
23 mind, yeah.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, please, you
25 go first.

1 MR. COPP: I'm Robert Copp with Caltrans. I'm the
2 Chief Division of Traffic Operations.

3 I took down a few comments, as I was listening to
4 the conversation so far and on the surface I agree with
5 having bicycle representatives on the CTCDC. I think that
6 it's important that we recognize the changes that are
7 happening. You made a really good point earlier about 40
8 years and not a lot of progress and all of a sudden things
9 are happening. I also think that the point was well made
10 here that the CTCDC has spent a lot of time on bike issues
11 and has done a pretty good job on it in the last year. Not
12 perfect, room for growth but, we do have to take into
13 account that as a department, from Caltrans' perspective,
14 we're implementing a complete streets policy. We need to
15 look at everybody, not just cars. We're looking at a smart
16 mobility program, move-ability, accessibility, connectivity,
17 we're trying to get ourselves, as Wayne Henley mentioned
18 earlier, we're trying to bring ourselves from 1970
19 something, when we started to be Caltrans, to actually start
20 being a Department of Transportation. And also there's
21 AB32. Now, we need to deal with the greenhouse gas
22 emissions, climate change and how better to do that than to
23 get more people on bikes.

24 Now, how we do that is the question that I need
25 help from this body. It's a very complicated issue. I

1 personally don't like committees, they get too big. I think
2 this committee is the right size. If we add members to it,
3 it will become unwieldy, we won't be effective. See how
4 long the meeting is today with this size of a group, and
5 imagine what it would be like with doubling the number, even
6 two more would be tough.

7 So, we have to find a way to improve, I believe,
8 the Committee organization structure. I think we've not
9 done a good job in using the committees effectively. I
10 think one of the problems with the bicycle detection issue
11 was that the Committee wasn't well attended. We, as a body,
12 Caltrans, as providing leadership to this, did not follow up
13 to make sure that everyone from every aspect was attending
14 the meeting. So, when we got the final recommendations, we
15 all thought we were there, pretty close, but a few concerns.

16 But, it turned out that we didn't have full attendance at
17 that Committee. That's just not appropriate, cannot stand
18 and it must be corrected. And I appreciate advice, however,
19 you know, we'll have to, as Caltrans, decide how to do
20 something if we don't get a good recommendation. We'll need
21 to do something to structure those Committees effectively.
22 And then I'd like to find a way to get better dialogue and
23 discussion at these meetings. I think another really good
24 point was made, and I've heard it several times in the year
25 that I've been coming to your meetings, is that Robert's

1 rules of order is just a little too strict, you open up for
2 public hearing, then it comes back to the Committee, and the
3 Committee doesn't address the same issues, you go off in a
4 different direction, you decide in a different issue, you
5 start talking about a new topic, it's never opened back up
6 for discussion.

7 So, there are ways of doing it. I have some ideas
8 about how to do that. What I would suggest is that there
9 are changes we could make to the bylaws of this organization
10 to make these things more structured, to make sure if we do
11 effectively use CBAC, if we did not bring them in for an
12 experimentation, I apologize for that, and we should make
13 sure that's part of the structure. I think there are other
14 things we could do but the best way to do would be to get a
15 group together and talk about that, make a proposal for your
16 next meeting that would lay out a way to update the bylaws,
17 improve the Committee structure and provide better dialogue
18 during these meetings, that would include not only
19 bicyclists but pedestrians, ADA, transit, equestrians,
20 whoever else wants to come talk.

21 So, that's my two cents worth.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. You said
23 something I need to clarify, because I heard it a third time
24 today. That in 40 years no progress has been made. That
25 cannot be any farther from the truth. If you go look at the

1 infrastructure in California, we have one of the best
2 bicycle infrastructures in the country. We have bicycle
3 lanes on the streets that were built in the seventies.
4 Orange County arterial system was built, and Conrad Lipinski
5 is sitting there in the City of Irvine, he was designing
6 streets in the City of Irvine in the late seventies and
7 early eighties, and they all have dedicated bicycle lanes.
8 They have a wonderful bicycle trail system in most of
9 California. So, saying that no progress has been made is
10 kind of a little bit, I think, unfair.

11 Now, you mentioned about the complete street
12 policy and based on the complete street policy, you -- I'm
13 just asking these and again, you know, I don't have a
14 position, I'm listening -- I just want to understand the
15 logic. You said you have a complete street policy and as of
16 the result of the complete street policy and AB32, you think
17 that those are the reasons for adding membership
18 specifically from the Bicycle Advocacy on the Committee.

19 Now --

20 MR. COPP: That's not exactly what I said. So, if
21 you're going to restate my statements, I'd like to restate
22 your statements. That's incorrect.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, no, I
24 apologize. I apologize if I did that. In terms of
25 Committee operations and bylaws, the Committee operations

1 and bylaws were established by Caltrans when they
2 established the Committee. They can be changed at anytime,
3 that's different from the organization membership.

4 In terms of representation on the Devices
5 Committee, I would like to ask you this, and you may not
6 have it but, it may be good to take into consideration, what
7 percentage of the total system users in California are
8 bicycles, are pedestrians, are transit users and are
9 Americans with Disabilities? And I know for a fact that the
10 transit uses and Americans with Disabilities are
11 significantly larger percentage of total system users than
12 the bicyclists. So, if it's the inclusion based on the
13 interest, I think that you may want to look at the whole
14 thing in a package rather than trying to say oh, okay, and I
15 understand your inter-modal argument and all that but,
16 inter-modal is a lot more than bicycle, it's transit, it's
17 ADA, it's pedestrians.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: All the road users.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah. Anyway, so
20 with that, you know, I just want to understand, again, you
21 know, without -- I really am thinking out loud on this but,
22 the only reason I brought up the issue of 40 is because some
23 people here, we have made a career being proud that we
24 design good transportation system. One of them is sitting
25 over there, he's my mentor, Conrad Lipinski. Dave is

1 sitting over there. Zabir is sitting over there. For the
2 last 30 years that we have been doing this, we have been
3 designing bicycle facilities. So, if you go drive through a
4 lot of areas in Southern California, it has excellent
5 bicycle facilities, and it's not like that 40 years we
6 haven't done anything, we have just sat around. Now the
7 last two years all of a sudden the lightbulb went off.

8 But in terms of like adding, in terms of
9 inter-modal representation, I suggest that you strongly look
10 at the percentage of the total system users and based on
11 that make a decision.

12 Mr. Mansourian?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: You know, I heard
14 Robert, and I want to pick up on the part that he said,
15 which is towards the end of his statement. He says, hey
16 guys, we've determine there is a need, we need your help to
17 figure out how to solve that need. So, I want to take that
18 and move on with it.

19 I think the best way is a couple of us, and I'll
20 volunteer, and I talked to John as an incoming Chairman
21 representing a large city, John and I, Jim, Robert, whoever
22 else, Robert you think, let us get together, let us talk
23 about these issues. I am not convinced of the public
24 problem statement. I am not convinced what's the solution
25 but, I'm committed in figuring out how to solve it, so there

1 are no miscommunications, so we're all on the same side.

2 If -- I can tell you one thing, if I was
3 guaranteed that I would have you on the Committee for as
4 long as I'm on the Committee, I'll be voting for it in ten
5 seconds. But, no serious, because of what I have seen, you
6 know, how professional you have been and how widely you
7 advocate a position, you've been also very understanding of
8 other issues.

9 My job is a local agency, I have to make sure that
10 whatever we come up with is doable and it's practical. So,
11 at times we get defensive because we're being pulled and
12 pushed and, you know, when Long Beach comes out with a green
13 crosswalk, I don't know what mechanism you guys use but, in
14 ten minutes the President of my Board wants to know why he
15 doesn't get one. But, serious, those are the realities
16 that we have to deal with.

17 But, I think it's an opportunity, we might not
18 come to a solution but at least I think that's the best way,
19 is let John and I, Robert, Jim, whoever you guys think, you
20 know, spend a few hours, come back with the problem
21 statement, how to solve it, maybe the solution is different
22 than joining the Committee, maybe it is joining the
23 Committee and doing other things, I don't know but, that's
24 my suggestion on how going forward, because when I first
25 reads the problem statement, I'm not buying that. I do buy

1 many things you said, could be better communication, blah,
2 blah, blah but, you know, we're experts, we know everything
3 on this Committee but, the problem statement says we don't
4 know everything, you know.

5 But, serious, so that's my suggestion. I'd like
6 to help Robert and Caltrans Director on tackling this issue
7 and cooperatively and see how we can give him a couple of
8 solutions. Then it's, then we see where we go. That's my
9 recommendation.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you.

11 Mr. Knowles?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I mean two
13 different things. I mean I look at it from how would the
14 process we've experienced have improved if we had cyclist
15 representatives on this Committee, or how much does it work
16 better to be able to go to the Bicycle Advisory Committee,
17 really sit down and work through an issue with those
18 advocates, and then bring that back to this Committee. It's
19 almost like a subcommittee on that specialty, where we iron
20 out issues and really hear from everybody, and then bring it
21 back at this level, because, you know, I'm speaking to
22 Caltrans as a representative of cities, and so naturally my
23 mayor, my city council, my city manager, we deal with our
24 local cyclist, you know, whether it was the East Bay Bicycle
25 Coalition when I worked for Santa Barbara (sic) or the Santa

1 Barbara Bicycle Coalition for Santa Barbara County. So,
2 we've always had this, as a local city, balancing act
3 between all the special interests, the ADA, the transit, the
4 school, the pedestrians, the cars. And then I have to speak
5 for how do these policies we're talking about, how do we
6 implement them at the city level? And I'm only going to
7 speak from that level, that this is a much more manageable
8 group, it deals with the people administratively that have
9 to implement these policies once they're enacted, and have
10 to think through what problems are we going to run into
11 administratively. And I don't see that, you know, and I'm
12 not in your shoes, I don't know how you have to implement
13 this policy administratively the way I've got to sell it to
14 my mayor and I've got to deal with the political fallout and
15 just how we make it all work. I think it's a different
16 perspective than just advocates would have, because we have
17 to take the MUTCD and go back and actually apply it. And
18 these different groups don't have to apply these rules and
19 worry about the application and where do we need to tweak
20 language because of this realized situation and this
21 difficulty we're going to have in applying this rule.

22 So, you know, I'm fairly new to this Committee at
23 this same time, so I'm comfortable with this format, and I
24 dread, you know, the camels we'd end up with if a larger
25 committee were trying to design a horse, you know, it's

1 tough enough as it is right now.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. We will
3 come back to you. Let's go to the Chief.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I concur with a lot of
5 statements that were made. I think, you know, Robert Copp
6 from Caltrans has already -- Robert Copp has already
7 acknowledged or suggested that there's ways that we could
8 improve efficiencies, that we could make better use of the
9 subcommittees and committees that are already at our
10 disposal. I'd agree with what's been said earlier that, you
11 know, the engineers, they are designing roadways for all
12 users, they are addressing the entire system. And it's not
13 just the cars, it's not just the people on the asphalt but,
14 it's how all those other things relate and how, besides
15 keeping everybody safe, you keep things moving, and you keep
16 good flowing and all that stuff. I think it's much more
17 comprehensive than that.

18 It's been mentioned that a couple of things have
19 not been run by CBAC before they've come to the Committee,
20 you know, that should have. By the same token, in the short
21 time that I've sat on this Committee, we've had cities and
22 counties come here and say oh, by the way, we'd like to tell
23 you that we installed this illegal striping a year ago and
24 maybe we should tell you about it. Those things happen.
25 And so when they happen, you try to redirect, and you try to

1 get everybody doing the way that it's supposed to be done,
2 you acknowledge it and try to take some corrective steps to
3 make sure it doesn't happen again, and everybody understands
4 the process, and you rely on the expertise that you've got.

5 And I guess another -- I'm still trying to figure
6 out how to process this but, you know, one of the statements
7 that Mr. Baross was making was talking about the AAA
8 membership here, and to me that statement was alluding to
9 the fact, or insinuating that AAA was an advocacy group.
10 And I'm not sure I follow that logic. If you want to call
11 AAA an advocacy group for traffic safety, I'll buy that but,
12 it's not like AAA is representing motorists and trying to
13 get as many people as they can behind the wheel of a car.
14 They're trying to improve traffic safety, and they have a
15 much more global approach than a narrow focus on a
16 particular mode of transportation or anything else. So, I
17 think there's a difference there in comparing AAA with some
18 other groups we might be talking about.

19 That's all I have to say.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Yes. I believe that
22 there are ways to improve the ability of our Committee to
23 get the perspectives of the different users of the highway.
24 You have committees, and I think there could be a greater
25 effort to inform those committees of the issues that are

1 coming before our committee, so that way we have the benefit
2 of your knowledge, your expertise and your perspective, just
3 as happened today.

4 I know when we went through this bicycle detection
5 and timing issue, we involved Bob Shanto, bicycle expert.
6 We didn't have your names but, still, the Chairman appointed
7 a subcommittee of bicycle experts, bicycle advocates, as
8 well as people who represent local jurisdictions, as well as
9 Caltrans, to come together and work out something, present
10 it to us so that we could have something to adopt. And
11 that's the process that occurred.

12 Now, maybe if we aren't -- if Caltrans isn't
13 reaching all of you, then maybe there could be improved
14 communication and involvement but, certainly I think there's
15 always been a willingness to include experts such as
16 yourselves in the deliberations when we're discussing
17 something special.

18 In my time on the Committee, the areas where we
19 have spent the most time have been on those special users,
20 bicyclists, pedestrians and the handicapped. We spent the
21 most time and we've had the most special committees to
22 deliberate those issues, so that we come out with something
23 that accommodates all uses of the highway system. And
24 highway includes sidewalks, roadway doesn't but, highway
25 includes sidewalks, and we adopt the California MUTCD on

1 streets and highways, it includes all users.

2 But, I would submit that if we -- what are we here
3 for? We are here, you established us, Caltrans, to satisfy
4 Section 21-400 of the Vehicle Code, that says that before
5 you adopt regulations, you shall seek the advice of local
6 jurisdictions. And you use us as that opportunity for that.

7 We are not here to be advocates for special modes
8 or users. If we were, we'd have a committee of at least 40.

9 And some of us participate in that Committee at the
10 National level where there are 40 voting members, and they
11 represent a number of organizations, whether they're the
12 road users or ITE, or whether they're the advocacy for the
13 blind, or bicycle advocates, there are any number of
14 advocates, and you have a committee of 40. Once you open
15 that door, that we want these special interests, modal
16 interests, you end up with a committee of 40. But, to
17 deliberate on those, there's 250 members at the National
18 Committee level, that deliberate on these, make
19 recommendations that go to the Board of 40, because they
20 want all interest involved. That's what we would end up
21 with.

22 So, we're here to satisfy Section 21-400 of the
23 Vehicle Code, which says you shall consult with local
24 jurisdictions. That's the only reason we're here. If you
25 want a committee on complete streets, that could be another

1 committee but, we're here to satisfy that provision of the
2 Vehicle Code. I don't think we could be very effective, and
3 now it's 5:30 already, but I don't think we could be more
4 efficient if we opened it up to nine, ten, 12, 20, 40
5 members, it just wouldn't work.

6 So, I think the structure we have, where you seek
7 the advice of local jurisdictions, who are in charge of
8 meeting the needs of pedestrians, meeting the needs of the
9 blind, meeting the needs of bicyclists, meeting the needs of
10 people who need to truck their goods in and load, meeting
11 the needs of all uses of the highway, that's what local
12 jurisdictions do. And I've got to balance all those things
13 when I go back to my day job. We're already doing that.
14 And I've got to balance bicycle concerns with every other
15 concern. We are doing that. So, I'm not here as a modal
16 interest. I'm not here oblivious to the needs of the blind.

17 I'm not here oblivious to the needs of bicyclists, and I'm
18 certain welcome to be educated by the expertise that's
19 provided to me by those who are more familiar with the
20 subject. But, I'm not here as an advocate. And I'm just
21 worried that if we try to bring in all the special interest
22 and advocates, we'll be an unwieldy committee.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you,
24 Mr. Fisher.

25 Ms. Wong?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: I agree with the comments
2 that were made. I've been on the Committee for about three
3 years now and I have always been impressed with the way that
4 the Committee looks at issues objectively, and when there
5 are issues that are specific to a special interest or need,
6 that that group is usually well informed of the meetings and
7 are well represented here and ample time is given to both
8 sides of the issue if there are, you know, more than one
9 opinion about it. And I feel like we deliberate, you know,
10 effectively about the issues. And certainly having the
11 people on the Committee who represent the cities and the
12 counties, those are the people who implement things, and the
13 one thing that I lack is I don't have that practical
14 knowledge or experience, you know, with a lot of these
15 issues. And so having that expertise, I think is really
16 important. And the fact that they, you know, they're not
17 representing any modal interest, they have to represent the
18 citizens and the residents and the users of their cities or
19 county roads, and I think they do a good job of doing that.
20 And I think a lot of these, like the cities, have special
21 bicycle coordinators and even departments.

22 As AAA, we worked closely with the City of San
23 Francisco, we've also worked with the San Francisco Bike
24 Coalition. I've been a member of the Bike Coalition for
25 probably as long as I've worked for AAA, and we've

1 collaborated with them on issues like good road and
2 pavement, making sure that we have, you know, we don't have
3 huge potholes for bikes or motorists, that's not good for
4 anyone.

5 I do feel like I have to defend AAA a little bit.
6 We've tried to, you know, evolve as the 100 year old
7 Association that did start as a motoring club, an automobile
8 club, it's in our name, we can't really get over that but,
9 we do represent multi modal interests and we've always tried
10 to be an advocate of all users of the transportation system.
11 And I think that we do that, especially the California AAA
12 Clubs, and there are a number of other clubs across the
13 country that maybe represent other interests but, in
14 California we have so much transit and bicyclists and I
15 think that AAA has evolved beyond that, you know, automobile
16 or motorist interest. And so I think that we are the in the
17 unique position of being kind of the consumer interest
18 group, and all users of the transportation system. And I
19 hope that we do a good job of doing that. Thanks.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you. At
21 the risk of cutting it short, I was told we have to be out
22 of here by 5:45 the latest, because Devinder needs to pack.

23 There's another group that has the room at 6:00 o'clock,
24 and he needs 15 minutes to get this stuff out.

25 So, go ahead, Mr. Babico.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: One thing I would like
2 to say, that if we accept restructuring or open this item, I
3 bet you it will lead us to a very wide open door. I
4 remember in the past there was another group came before
5 this panel to have been represented in the panel, and they
6 were the vendors. And we discussed that issue in a very
7 lengthy time and the decision was, well, if we do that then
8 there are other users, road users, they have to be accepted.

9 Believe me, if we open this one, next meeting we will have
10 so many other several applications for the same
11 representation in the panel. And one of them is probably
12 the Truck Association, they are very vital users to the
13 roadways and they pay higher taxes. I mean they will be
14 here. Golf carts users, they will be there. Mothers
15 Against Drunk Drivers, although they are not a vendor, or
16 they are not bicyclists or pedestrians, but they are
17 affecting the traffic. Would you allow them to go?

18 So, how far do we go? Where do we draw the line?

19 So, it is very, very sensitive issue. And yet, this
20 Committee is an advisory to the state, and the state, they
21 do have a branch of the bicyclists, and they are in
22 continuous communication with these groups. So, as we are
23 advisory, and of course I mean the CBAC will be advising the
24 Caltrans, and Caltrans bring it to us, these issues, and we
25 will discuss them, as we are doing them today and before,

1 and even in the future we'll continue doing that.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you. Okay.
3 We have like a very few minutes because we have one or more
4 items for our next meeting.

5 Mr. Copp and Mr. Henley, was that your view,
6 pretty much you heard what the Committee has said?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah, I think just about
8 everything I was going to say was --

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And I think
10 Mr. Mansourian made the suggestion to make himself and
11 Mr. Fisher available to sit down with you and further work
12 through your issues and see what other possible potential
13 alternatives might be available, so that you have all the
14 facts. And thank you for bringing it to the Committee, we
15 appreciate it.

16 Any other issue on this? Any other discussion?

17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Next meeting.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Mr. Singh
19 is suggesting for the next meeting, this is Item No. 11 by
20 the way, Mr. Singh is suggesting, if you please take out
21 your calendars, he's looking at either April 22nd or April
22 29th, or May 6th or May 13th.

23 Let's go with the first one, April 22nd, are there
24 any members that cannot make April 22nd? You cannot, two
25 cannot make, three cannot make.

1 April 29th?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It's spring break time.

3 A week earlier would have worked better.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: How about May
5 6th? May 6th everyone, it's after spring break, no?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: My problem is anytime
7 before April 20th is our budget time and I've got to black
8 out three weeks for that.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Before April
10 20th.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: So, for my
12 participation, it would have to be before the 20th.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, let's go --
14 how about April 15th? Mr. Fisher? How about April 15th?
15 Tax Day, hey nobody is going to forget that. How about
16 April 15th? If you say yes, remember you have to post your
17 taxes the day before, because you're going to be here until
18 like 6:00 o'clock, so.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Mr. Chairman, the
20 rule is we're not going to change.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, yeah,
22 because it's really difficult to schedule --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Because we schedule
24 and then two people later on change their mind and then we
25 come with up with a date that some of us cannot make.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah. It defeats
2 the whole idea of having the item on the agenda.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: A thousand dollar
4 fine if you want to change.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, because if
6 something comes up and then you want to change and say I
7 cannot come, then Devinder has to go through a lot of
8 trouble and it's very difficult to find the time.

9 April 15th is as good as it gets because it's Tax
10 Day, nobody is going to forget. Is April 15th good? Going
11 to the left, going to the right.

12 (Asides.)

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: April 15th is good.
14 I suggest nobody can change it.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, in terms of
16 location, where is it going to be, south, middle, north.
17 North being what, Sacramento or Bay Area, Marin County?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Whichever you like.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: To be determined.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: May be I can suggest
21 possibly Sacramento because I'd like for us to meet in a
22 workshop the day before.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: On the 14th?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Right.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Have our technical
2 workshop and I'd like Caltrans maybe to put together maybe
3 the smaller chapters that we can review and get those out of
4 the way. And then so that later in the year we can review
5 some of the big chapters that are, would take a lot of --

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, next
7 meeting is going to be on April 15th in Sacramento, the day
8 before on April 14th there is going to be a workshop.

9 (Asides, cross talk.)

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: To ask a question
11 I'm sorry, on the 14th, did we decide we're having a
12 Committee meeting or workshop?

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Workshop.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: We don't need to be
15 there, because I can't do the 14th.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So then we come back
17 to the same point, we don't need to be there, correct?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So, we don't need,
20 so we shouldn't -- so 14th is optional.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER FISHER: Who is "we don't need"?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Well that's what I'm
23 trying to --

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. On the
25 14th, Mr. Bhullar, if you send out the agenda that you see,

1 the items that are going to be discussed on the 14th in the
2 workshop, so the members can decide if they want to
3 participate or not, depending on their area of interest.

4 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.

5 The way I see the workshop is it's supposed to be pretty
6 much on the workshops we set the agenda or the tone as to
7 what we want to discuss and like John is suggesting,
8 probably I'll have, rather than the sign, marking and
9 signal, I'll have the other parts which are less small
10 topics, and then with that either the Committee can set up
11 right now as to which members want to participate, or I can
12 throw out the invitation and everyone can decide as to who
13 is going to come into those technical type of workshops.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Fair enough.

15 Good suggestion. Is that clear?

16 Okay. With that, if there are no other items --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Well there is, I
18 mean no other items for us but just a point of information.

19 Robert was saying that he talked and Orange County,
20 everything is shut down as well?

21 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, they canceled Orange County,
22 canceled Ontario, the only flights out of Burbank were late
23 tonight and they were all sold out already.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah.

25 (Asides regarding travel, cross talk, asides,

1 not transcribed per Director.)

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I need a motion
3 for adjournment. Let's have a motion to adjourn the
4 meeting. A motion and second?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Second.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. The
7 meeting is adjourned until April 15th.

8 (Thereupon, at 5:45 p.m. the meeting was adjourned
9 until the next scheduled meeting on April 15th.)

10 --o0o--

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, TROY RAY, an electronic reporter, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Traffic Control Devices Committee meeting; that thereafter the tape recording was transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting, or in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 21st day of January, 2010.

Troy Ray
Official Reporter